

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 5--79th Congress

Chapter 5--1st Session

H. J. Res. 85

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law No. 5	1
Summary and Index of history on H. J. Res. 85	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW No. 5

Making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture. To increase by \$6,784,000 the appropriation for preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quinquennial Census of Agriculture.

Summary and Index of history on H. J. Res. 85

January 25, 1945	H. J. Res. 85 introduced by Rep. Cannon, Missouri. Referred to House Committee on Appropriations. Hearings. House.
February 2, 1945	Appropriation Committee reported without amendment. H. Rept. 52. Print of measure as reported by House Appropriations Committee.
February 5, 1945	House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 120 for consideration. H. Rept. 56.
February 6, 1945	Debate in House.
February 7, 1945	Passed House without amendment.
February 12, 1945	Print of measure as referred to Senate Appropriations Committee.
February 15, 1945	Print of measure as reported without amendment by Senate Appropriations Committee. S. Rept. 49.
February 19, 1945	Passed Senate without amendment.
February 28, 1945	Approved. Public Law No. 5.

29. BANKING AND CURRENCY. H. R. 1772, by Rep. McMillan, S. C., regulating the amount of interest to be paid by insolvent or alleged insolvent banks in liquidation or in the hands of receivers. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 533.)
30. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 1774, by Rep. Sheppard, Calif., to provide for the location, survey, and building of a national system of superhighways. To Roads Committee. (p. 533.)
31. FLOOD CONTROL. H. R. 1778, by Rep. Lea, Calif., to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Smith River, Calif., and Oreg., for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention. To Flood Control Committee. (p. 533.)
32. NATIONAL SERVICE. H. R. 1779, by Rep. Voorhis, Calif., to provide for the regulation of civilian employment to aid in the prosecution of the war. To Military Affairs Committee. (p. 533.)
33. MINING. H. R. 1780, by Rep. Engle, Calif., to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war. To Mines and Mining Committee. (p. 534.)
34. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE; APPROPRIATIONS. H. J. Res. 85, by Rep. Cannon, Mo., making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture. To Appropriations Committee. (p. 534.)
35. VETERANS. H. Res. 106, by Rep. E. A. Hall, N. Y., directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the manner in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is being administered. To Rules Committee. (P. 534.) Remarks of author (pp. 516-8).

- o -

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654, or send to Room 112 Adm. Building. Arrangements may be made to be kept advised of developments on any particular bill.

- o -

COMMITTEE-HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Jan. 26: S. Banking and Currency Committee, CCC bill (Judge Jones).
- Jan. 29: E. Banking and Currency Committee, CCC bill (Judge Jones and Secretary Wickard).

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

ON

H. J. Res. 85

A JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING AN ADDITIONAL
APPROPRIATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR
1945 FOR THE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

JAMES F. SCANLON, *Administrative Assistant, Editor*



COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Virginia	JOHN TABER, New York
LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana	RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
MALCOLM C. TARVER, Georgia	D. LANE POWERS, New Jersey
JED JOHNSON, Oklahoma	CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Vermont
J. BUELL SNYDER, Pennsylvania	EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Illinois
EMMETT O'NEAL, Kentucky	ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan	KARL STEFAN, Nebraska
JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina	FRANCIS H. CASE, South Dakota
GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas	FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin
HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California	NOBLE J. JOHNSON, Indiana
BUTLER B. HARE, South Carolina	ROBERT F. JONES, Ohio
ALBERT THOMAS, Texas	BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
JOE HENDRICKS, Florida	H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio	HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho
JOHN M. COFFEE, Washington	WALTER C. PLOESER, Missouri
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas	HARVE TIBBOTT, Pennsylvania
JAMIE L. WITTEN, Mississippi	WALT HORAN, Washington
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois	DEAN M. GILLESPIE, Colorado
JAMES M. CURLEY, Massachusetts	
ALBERT GORE, Tennessee	
THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, Jr., Maryland	
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama	
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York	
HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, Connecticut	

JOHN C. PUGH, *Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Virginia	JOHN TABER, New York
LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana	RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
J. BUELL SNYDER, Pennsylvania	D. LANE POWERS, New Jersey
EMMETT O'NEAL, Kentucky	EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Illinois
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan	
JED JOHNSON, Oklahoma	

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

HEARING CONDUCTED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN CHARGE OF DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, MESSRS. CLARENCE CANNON (CHAIRMAN), CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, LOUIS LUDLOW, J. BUELL SNYDER, EMMET O'NEAL, LOUIS C. RABAUT, JED JOHNSON, JOHN TABER, RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, D. LANE POWERS, AND EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, ON THE DAYS FOLLOWING, NAMELY:

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1945.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

STATEMENTS OF J. C. CAPT, DIRECTOR; R. E. GALLOWAY, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR; AND J. T. MOORE, CHIEF, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE DIVISION

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

AMOUNT APPROPRIATED 1945 AND ESTIMATES REQUESTED

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Capt, we have a resubmission of the estimate for the quinquennial census of agriculture submitted in House Document No. 33:

For an additional amount for Census of Agriculture, including the objects specified under this heading in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, \$6,784,000, to remain available until December 31, 1946, \$6,784,000.

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe we appropriated for this purpose in 1945, \$7,250,000.

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to that, in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, you were given \$650,000 for this purpose.

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What disposition was made of that \$650,000?

Mr. CAPT. The \$650,000 was allotted to the Bureau for the purpose of beginning the planning incident to the taking of the regular quinquennial census in agriculture.

Mr. TABER. Now, you did not tell what was done with it. You say it was allotted——

The CHAIRMAN. He has not completed his answer.

Mr. CAPT. It was used for that purpose. There was a small amount carried over until the next fiscal year and combined with the appropriation subsequently made, to be used to further the census.

The CHAIRMAN. How much of that \$650,000 have you left at this time, or how much did you spend in 1944?

Mr. MOORE. We spent \$254,275 and carried over \$395,725.

Mr. CAPT. We spent that sum, \$254,275, in the fiscal year 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. How much was carried over?

Mr. MOORE. \$395,725 was carried over and combined with the \$7,250,000 appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. That gave you your balance plus the further appropriation in 1945 of \$7,250,000, which gave you a total of how much as of last July 1?

Mr. MOORE. \$7,645,725.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you are asking for an additional \$6,784,000?

Mr. MOORE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Capt, when you were before us in November on this same item, you only asked at that time for \$5,500,000.

Mr. CAPT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I was just wondering why this increase of \$1,284,000?

Mr. CAPT. The \$5,500,000 was the sum that was submitted to the Congress; it was not the sum we estimated we would need. This sum now submitted is the sum we originally estimated we would need.

The CHAIRMAN. It was cut down by the Budget?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And this time it is allowed by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if this amount is granted, your total available for the project, going back to July 1, would be \$14,429,725; then if we include the 1944 expenditure out of your \$650,000, you would have a total of \$14,684,000. That is what you contemplate at present?

Mr. CAPT. That is what it adds up to; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say to the members of the committee there is a break-down of this on page 6, and we will include that in the record at this point.

(The matter above referred to is as follows:)

Schedule of obligations—Summary

	Actual, 1944	Estimate, 1945	Estimate, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Total
Man-years.....	34.2	4,065.2	1,398.2	72	5,569.6
Personal services:					
Temporary employment, departmental.....	\$77,197	\$1,665,094	\$2,398,036	\$129,120	\$4,269,447
Overtime, departmental.....	12,960	279,736			292,696
All personal services, departmental.....	90,157	1,944,830	2,398,036	129,120	4,562,143
Temporary employment, field.....		7,001,140			7,001,140
Overtime, field.....		1,101,060			1,101,060
All personal services, field.....		8,102,200			8,102,200
01 Personal services (net).....	90,157	10,047,030	2,398,036	129,120	12,664,343
02 Travel.....	9,029	350,900	6,400		366,329
03 Transportation of things.....	19	53,700	5,000		58,719
04 Communication services.....	990	37,440	2,790		41,220
05 Rents and utility services.....	3,405	167,177	332,853	51,660	555,095
06 Printing and binding.....	17,009	311,485	173,659		502,153
07 Other contractual services.....	124,006	12,100	2,100		138,206
08 Supplies and materials.....	6,649	154,350	42,425		203,424
09 Equipment.....	3,011	141,400	10,100		154,511
Total other obligations.....	164,118	1,228,552	575,327	51,660	2,019,657
Grand total obligations.....	254,275	11,275,582	2,973,363	180,780	14,684,000

SCOPE OF AND AUTHORIZATION AND NECESSITY FOR CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would give us at this time a statement, if you will, giving us three things. We would like to have the scope of the census—what you are covering; we would like to have the authorization under which you are proceeding; and we would like to have you tell us why you think it is necessary to take this census at this time, when we are in the midst of a great war, when manpower is at a minimum, and money is hard to get.

Mr. CAPT. The census is required by law; it is not permissive or discretionary. United States Code, title 13, section 216, provides for a quinquennial census of agriculture and livestock which will show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country which shall relate to the crop year. The Director of the Census has no election in the matter; the law directs it shall be done.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you expect to cover in this census?

Mr. CAPT. We expect to cover all of the farms and ranges of the country, as required by law; the acreage of farm land; the acreage of principal crops; and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country which shall relate to the crop year, and other farm characteristics required in order to get a true economic picture of the agricultural plant of the country.

TRAINING OF SUPERVISORS AND ENUMERATORS

The CHAIRMAN. Under the terms of the original appropriation, this census was not to begin prior to January 1, 1945. What have you accomplished up to this time, or what has been accomplished up to this time?

Mr. CAPT. We have completed our training of supervisors and began the training of enumerators in preparation of actually beginning the farm enumeration in the field on January 8.

The CHAIRMAN. You have completed the training of enumerators throughout the United States?

Mr. CAPT. No, sir; we have completed the training of the supervisors and began the training of enumerators so that we might get out in the field on January 8. We have not been able to get sufficient enumerators. I do not know for sure, but I think we have gotten about 20 percent of what we need.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that due to a lack of funds or due to a stringency in the manpower situation?

Mr. CAPT. It is primarily due to a lack of sufficient funds in order to pay an adequate rate for services of enumerators.

PROBLEM OF SECURING ENUMERATORS

If I may, I would like to read into the record some excerpts from reports that have come from the field, which will give you a pretty complete understanding of where we stand today.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. CAPT. The following excerpts were taken at random out of reports coming into Washington from the field supervisors for the 1945 census of agriculture.

From Florida :

* * * Basically, of course, our greatest problem is finding enumerators to do the work for the reason that rates over the entire State are generally so low that it makes hiring of these people difficult. * * *

From Nebraska :

* * * We have a large number of enumerators that have taken one assignment with the understanding that that is all they will take unless we have an official notification of an increase in rates. * * *

Again from Nebraska :

* * * After completion of school for farm census, enumerators feel they cannot work for present rates. * * *

Another one from Nebraska :

* * * We would open a school with plenty of enumerators, and the minute they found out what the rate was, they would get up and walk out. * * *

From Nebraska again :

* * * We are having difficulty securing enough enumerators to cover the area because the piece-price schedule seems to be too low. * * *

Again from Nebraska :

* * * Supervisors have gone out to hold school and although the trainees showed up they got up and left when they found out what the rate of pay was. * * *

Then from Idaho :

* * * We have calls and letters every day for an increase in pay. * * *

From Minnesota :

* * * About 50 percent of all applicants refuse to take the job when they find out the enumerators' pay, some enumerators quitting at the school because of the rate of pay. * * *

From Minnesota again :

The enumerators are dissatisfied with the present rate and have sent a petition requesting that the rate be raised. * * *

Again from Minnesota :

It will be impossible to get anyone to enumerate these farms at that rate. No one will enumerate it for the prevailing rate of pay. * * *

From Alabama :

* * * The best enumerators have turned back their portfolios because of the rates being too small. We would be able to secure better enumerators with a little increase in piece-price rates. I have been having to make substitutions in every county where we have held schools. * * *

More from Alabama :

* * * This week I held a school at Talledega. I opened with five prospects from Clay County and about seven from Talledega. All of the Clay County men walked out on me after the second day, and all but three of the Talledega men walked out. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Now, on the remaining three pages there, you have much the same kind of report?

Mr. CAPT. Much the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you include that in the record.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to hear it. I want to hear from my State.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; go ahead.

Mr. CART. From California:

* * * I really believe the situation is serious in this area and that if we are to secure a reasonably accurate enumeration in California there will certainly have to be an upward revision of the fixed unit rates. * * *

More from California:

* * * We will have considerable difficulty in obtaining enumerators in taking the agricultural census in this area, due to the low rate of pay. * * * When I told the enumerators the scale of pay, they dropped the matter like a hot potato. * * *

From Wyoming:

* * * After studying the rates, all enumerators decided to drop out of the class at the end of the first day and the school was necessarily discontinued. * * *

From Kansas:

* * * I seriously wonder how we can finish this work unless the piece-price schedule is increased. * * *

From Rhode Island:

* * * After 2 days of work, we have already had four resignations due to low rates of pay. * * * These people honestly say that after paying for their gasoline and oil and the wear and tear on their cars, they actually lost money, and I really feel that they certainly made no money for the time they expended. * * *

From Mississippi:

* * * We have made every effort to secure enumerators and have failed because of the low price rate. * * *

From Missouri:

* * * Our supervisors are unable to get enumerators because of the low price offered per farm. * * *

Again from Missouri:

* * * I earnestly recommend that enumerators be paid a higher rate. The county agent and triple A officials have told me unless the pay was increased they didn't believe I would be able to get anyone to do this work. * * *

From New Mexico:

Impossible to do this work at the prices per farm. It would not be enough to even cover their expenses. * * *

From Georgia:

* * * Thirty-four applicants reported at training school. All except nine left when they learned the rate of pay. * * *

From New Jersey:

* * * Prospective enumerators refused to accept enumerators' jobs or dropped from the classes when the rates were explained on the last day. * * *

From North Carolina:

* * * Seems clear it will not be possible to procure at present rate of pay sufficient enumerators to take the agricultural census. * * *

Again from North Carolina:

* * * I have had a number of applicants for jobs as enumerators but when told what the price would be per schedule, they were not interested. * * *

From North Dakota:

* * * Under the present rate basis, the local supervisor has found it absolutely impossible to find anyone who will enumerate these farms at the prices indicated. * * *

From North Dakota again:

It is found that enumerators will not work at the piece-price rate set up by the Bureau of the Census. * * *

From Oklahoma:

* * * Local supervisors are having trouble in recruiting enumerators and holding them, due to the low rates. * * *

Again from Oklahoma:

Local supervisor tells me that he will not be able to hold his enumerators if he can't increase the rates. * * *

From Oklahoma again:

* * * Forty-two prospects contacted this county but when they see schedule and learn rates they drop out. * * *

From Oregon:

Enumerators in Malheur County on strike for increase in pay. * * *

From Pennsylvania:

* * * In order to secure workers it is necessary to increase the pay offered for this enumeration. * * *

From Texas:

* * * In order to continue the census work, an increase in pay must become effective. * * *

From Utah:

Rates must be increased or it will be impossible to secure the services of enumerators at the prices suggested by Washington. * * *

From Washington:

* * * I sincerely believe all rates should be raised. This would insure the obtaining of competent and reliable men and women to do this important work.

From Wisconsin:

* * * Up to date, no enumerators has accepted these enumeration districts, and it seems that they will not at the present rate. * * *

Even Members of the Congress have expressed concern over the inadequacies of Agriculture piece-price rates as evidenced by the following:

From North Carolina:

Seems clear it will not be possible to procure at present rate of pay sufficient enumerators to take agriculture census. * * * Looks like entire organization will go to pieces unless something more effective can be done quickly.

From Pennsylvania:

I will appreciate it if you will give this matter your most serious consideration and I want to express the hope that, after considering, you can and will find it possible to offer a price per farm which would be in line somewhat with the work performed and permit those, who are in charge of taking the census, to obtain qualified persons to do the work in the manner in which you want it done. Otherwise, I am fearful that you will not get a good job.

Those are just a few of the ones that have come in.

NUMBER OF ENUMERATORS REQUIRED, PAY, METHOD OF SELECTING, AND TERM OF EMPLOYMENT

The CHAIRMAN. How many enumerators will it be necessary to employ throughout the United States?

Mr. CAPT. It will run from 25 to 27 to 28 thousand; something of that sort, if we had all we wanted to do the job quickly. Of course, if we got that number, we would finish in a shorter time than we will finish if we do not get that number. With a reduced number, it would mean we will stretch out the field coverage over a longer period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you employing both men and women?

Mr. CAPT. Both men and women; principally, women, however.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is the women who are walking out?

Mr. CAPT. It is all of them—men and women alike.

The CHAIRMAN. What amount have you obligated thus far; that is, what definite commitments have you made that must be liquidated whether this work goes on or not?

Mr. MOORE. To date, we have obligated a little over \$2,000,000. That is in actual obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. That must be paid?

Mr. MOORE. That must be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. Even if the thing were dropped right now?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir; plus the fact that for the enumerators who are hired in the field, and the enumeration cost will run considerable. We do not know exactly what that is. That is being disbursed in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. You feel that you could get the necessary number of enumerators if you were authorized to pay a somewhat higher rate?

Mr. CAPT. That is the tenor of all these reports—that the people are available, but they won't do the work for the price offered. We clear our people through the U. S. E. S., so that we are not cutting into the normal labor force. These people that are requested of the U. S. E. S. are people who are available for this type of work and not available for war work.

Mr. LUDLOW. And many of them are women?

Mr. CAPT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average period of employment?

Mr. CAPT. We estimated if we began promptly early in January, we ought to have the major part of the field work done through January and February, with some loose ends to clean up in March.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say, as an average, that each enumerator would require about 2 months?

Mr. CAPT. Yes; 6 weeks to 2 months.

The CHAIRMAN. What would their compensation average?

Mr. CAPT. It is pretty hard to estimate that sum. It depends on how they work. One enumerator might work 12 or 14 hours a day and make a considerable amount; another one might work for 6 or 7 hours a day. They are on a piece-price basis and can work as they see fit. They are not on a time schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. I see in the justification you estimate it would amount to about 89.8 cents per schedule.

Mr. CAPT. That is the average. They may run as low as 35 or 40 cents in some areas and as high as 70 cents in other areas, depending on conditions and density of farms.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you say would be the maximum?

Mr. GALLOWAY. I would say the maximum rate will run around \$6, as a rough guess, in the Mountain States, where the farms are widely separated and there is only a farm every 6 or 7 miles or more.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not mean \$6 per schedule?

Mr. GALLOWAY. Yes, per farm.

The CHAIRMAN. But that is exceptional?

Mr. GALLOWAY. That is right.

Mr. CAPT. They might have to travel all day to get one or two farms or ranches.

The CHAIRMAN. How do these amounts compare with the amounts used in support of the previous appropriation and the 1945 estimates?

Mr. CAPT. I think we estimated an average of around 50 to 60 cents per schedule all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. As compared with 89.8 cents now?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir. May I go back to the obligations incurred thus far; I want to be sure about that. Mr. Moore said something there about \$2,000,000 obligated. That is what we know about.

Mr. MOORE. Just what we know about.

Mr. CAPT. There are obligations in the field that we do not know about, because they are disbursing money in the field, and it will run considerably more than \$2,000,000. And if we had to stop operations, it would cost a sizable sum just to button up operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this question: Of course, this is a vital question: You feel if sufficient money were provided to pay the prevailing wage rates, you could get the enumerators?

Mr. CAPT. We think we could get them.

The CHAIRMAN. But could you get them without interference with the war program, in view of the critical manpower problem at this time?

Mr. CAPT. We feel sure we can, because we clear our people through the local United States Employment Service offices and we point our recruiting directly at farm families, primarily, the members of which cannot and will not leave home to go to work in war production centers. We aim at getting honorably discharged veterans who may not be able to do heavier work; members of veterans' families who cannot and will not leave home to do other work, and members of families of men who are still in the service. But having cleared all our people through the United States Employment Service, we have assurance they are not used for census work if they are suitable for war work. We cannot use them if they are available for war work.

The CHAIRMAN. How are these enumerators selected? I take it for granted that you issue instructions which are to be followed in recruiting these enumerators. Just give us a summary of the instructions which you issue with reference to the selection of employees.

Mr. CAPT. The supervisory staff has instructions to look to farm families first for enumerators.

The CHAIRMAN. That is because you feel they would be more proficient in obtaining that data?

Mr. CAPT. Yes. They know farming.

The CHAIRMAN. They would be more familiar with it?

Mr. CAPT. Yes; they would know it from the farm end and understand farm crops and equipment. In addition, in the wintertime when

we are taking the census, there is usually not too much work to do on the farm. They have to do their chores and certain things, but they are free a part of each day to do additional work, if they elect to do it.

Then our supervisors are instructed to go to veterans, to members of veterans' families, members of families of men still in the services, giving special attention to securing women, and clearing them all through the local United States employment offices, so that we do not cut into the normal labor supply.

The CHAIRMAN. And women can do this work just as efficiently, just as satisfactorily and promptly as men?

Mr. CAPT. Generally we find that women make better enumerators than men.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you account for that?

Mr. CAPT. Well, they are probably inclined to be a little more interested in it. Some of our people, speaking facetiously, say women naturally are more curious and will ask more questions and get more information.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you expect to complete this field work some time in March, or expect to do this field work principally in February?

Mr. CAPT. We do not know now. We have been so seriously delayed that it may go over into March further than we thought it would; that is, part of the load will go into March. And if we are delayed much more, part of it may even go over into April. It may go over into May or even June if we are delayed too much.

The CHAIRMAN. But, regardless of the length of time required, this is piece work and the cost per enumerator will be no greater if it runs over a few weeks, than if it is completed in February?

Mr. CAPT. No; the cost of the enumerator will not be greater; but the general over-all cost will be greater, because we have to maintain the administrative and organization staff.

The CHAIRMAN. If your enumeration work would be completed approximately, on an average, in March, when would you expect the rest of the work to be completed?

Mr. CAPT. It would probably take through May. If the enumeration is completed in March, it will take through May for the supervisory staff to get all of the schedules properly checked, close up the work in the local offices, and get the returns shipped back to Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. I see on page 7 of the justifications you have set up \$1,101,118 for overtime of the field employees; that applies principally to your enumerators?

Mr. CAPT. Principally; yes, sir. That is the overtime fixed by law; it is not overtime in hours as such, but it is so-called overtime.

Mr. TABER. You mean that is the 15-percent bonus?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir; that is the 15-percent bonus fixed by law.

The CHAIRMAN. That rate per schedule which you have given us before, 89.8 cents, I believe you said—

Mr. CAPT. Approximately that; that is an estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that include overtime?

Mr. CAPT. That does not include overtime; that is the base rate.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately what would you say would be your average rate with overtime included, if overtime is included?

Mr. MOORE. About \$1.02, or \$1.03 per schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe you can complete the work at that rate with the \$6,784,000 additional you request in this estimate?

Mr. CAPT. Insofar as we can judge now, from the evidence we have before us, we think we can. Of course, we thought 18 months ago we could complete it for less than that. Generally, people felt the war was going to terminate sooner than has turned out thus far; but, insofar as we can see now, it looks as though we can complete the job with this additional sum.

Now, conditions could change; situations could arise that nobody knows about now which might change our program to such an extent that we could not do it for this; but, so far as we are able to judge now, we think it can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. You have every reason to believe it can be done at the present time?

Mr. CAPT. With the evidence before us now, insofar as it is humanly possible to judge, based on the information before us.

Mr. LUDLOW. I was very much interested in what you said about some of the enumerators in one of the States going on strike, did they not know, when they took these positions, what the pay was?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir; they were told.

Mr. LUDLOW. Then why would they go on strike, knowing all the facts in advance?

Mr. CAPT. I imagine this is the situation: They knew the rates; they went out and began to do the work and found that the rate per piece, the piece-price rate per schedule, for example, was so low that they could not make an adequate amount of money per day.

Mr. LUDLOW. In what State was that?

Mr. CAPT. That was in Oregon.

Mr. LUDLOW. You have authority, do you not, Mr. Capt, to fix the pay of the enumerators administratively?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir. That authority is granted the Director of the Census by law.

Mr. LUDLOW. What would be your recommendation, or would you make a recommendation that they be paid more, and, if so, how much more?

INCREASED PAYMENTS TO ENUMERATORS

Mr. CAPT. By all means they must be paid more, as evidenced by these reports which are coming in from the field. We cannot fix on any definite sum by which the increase should be made, because conditions are not uniform throughout the country. For example, Mr. Ludlow, in an eastern State, like New Jersey, where the roads are good and they are kept free of snow in the winter, and the farms are small and close together, the increase there might be much less than you would have to grant in States like North Dakota, Wyoming, and the State of Washington, and in the Mountain States like Idaho and Colorado.

Mr. LUDLOW. If you were to increase the salaries of the enumerators to what you think they should be, how much of an additional burden would that place on this appropriation?

Mr. CAPT. We think if we get this \$6,784,000 which we are requesting that we would have enough, with what we have, to cover it.

Mr. LUDLOW. I was going to ask if you thought there was enough money in this estimate to get the necessary enumerator personnel.

Mr. CAPT. Yes; we think so if no new or unforeseen conditions arise, this appropriation, plus what we have.

AVAILABILITY OF ENUMERATOR PERSONNEL

Mr. LUDLOW. And you think you can get that personnel without impinging on the war effort, by taking persons of nonmilitary age, and those over age for the military service, and persons who would not be essentially needed in defense industries?

Mr. CAPT. By the device of clearing all of these people through the local United States employment offices we are assured against cutting in on the normal labor forces and those of military age.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is not your situation this: That you have enough appropriated at the present time to do the field work of this census of agriculture, but substantially no more than that, and if you go ahead with the operations that you are doing now you will have completed all of the field work, and you will have a mass of information that will be no good to anybody on earth unless it is processed further, through tabulation, and so forth, and that is the reason why you have to have this appropriation; is that correct?

Mr. CAPT. Well, it is even worse than that, Mr. Ludlow. We have not enough money to actually complete the field work at this time. We thought we did have enough to complete the field work, but in the light of this new evidence which I have just read into the record, bringing out conditions that we did not anticipate or know about, we have not even enough to complete the necessary field work.

AMOUNT REQUIRED TO COMPLETE FIELD WORK

Mr. LUDLOW. How much do you need to complete the field work?

Mr. GALLOWAY. That is on page 9 of the justifications. We need \$8,808,258.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is set forth as being necessary to complete the field work?

Mr. GALLOWAY. The total field cost.

COST OF OVERTIME PAY (PUBLIC LAW 49)

Mr. LUDLOW. This estimate is for \$6,784,000, but it does not take into consideration the element of overtime obligations under Public Law 49. In the report for 1944 the cost of Public Law 49 was \$1,101,000. What is your estimate of what the obligations would be under Public Law 49 if that law is reenacted?

Mr. MOORE. For the field operations, Mr. Ludlow, there will be none in 1946. We contemplate completing the field operations in 1945. This will be the total overtime for field operations. For departmental operations we have nothing in here for fiscal 1946.

Mr. LUDLOW. Do you have any estimate of what your overtime will be for 1946?

Mr. MOORE. \$505,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. \$505,000?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUDLOW. So the estimate presently before us, when you consider that necessary addition would not be \$6,784,000 as set forth here, but would be \$6,784,000, plus \$505,000. That would be the way it would work out.

Mr. CAPT. That \$505,000 would be applicable if Public Law 49 is reenacted. Under the present law that amount would not be required.

Mr. LUDLOW. But, presumably, it will be reenacted.

Mr. CAPT. Yes; presumably, it will be reenacted.

Mr. LUDLOW. So that the total cost would be the sum of these two items?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir.

FIELD ORGANIZATION

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Capt, by field work you mean setting up the organization to do the work?

Mr. CAPT. Getting our field staff, our State or area supervisors, our local supervisors, enumerators, and clerks.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is, the work you have been doing, the set-up which you describe as field work is merely getting the personnel together?

Mr. CAPT. Yes; and making the enumeration.

AMOUNT APPROPRIATED AND AMOUNT THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE IF ESTIMATE IS GRANTED

Mr. O'NEAL. How much money have you had up to this time, exclusive of what you are asking for in these estimates, Mr. Capt?

Mr. MOORE. The total appropriated?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; how much have you had available for this work?

Mr. MOORE. \$7,900,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. How much of that have you spent?

Mr. MOORE. You mean what we have spent to date?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; actually spent.

Mr. MOORE. To date the obligations that we have processed through our books are something in excess of \$2,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. \$2,000,000?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. And you have some obligations, I understand, that you do not know of yet?

Mr. CAPT. Yes; there are a lot of obligations in the field that may run into considerable sums, the amount of which we do not know yet.

Mr. O'NEAL. So that, you have a balance of somewhere around \$5,900,000, exclusive of some of the obligations that you do not know about, that has not been spent?

Mr. CAPT. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. And you are asking in addition how much?

Mr. CAPT. \$6,784,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. \$6,784,000?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'NEAL. And that does not include the possible overtime for 1945 if Public Law 49 is reenacted?

Mr. CAPT. Not for fiscal 1946, but it does provide overtime for fiscal 1945.

Mr. O'NEAL. And the total of that sum is \$1,101,000?

Mr. CAPT. That is for overtime in the fiscal year 1945 for field operations.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is not mentioned in these estimates, and that is an amount over and above what you are actually asking for here, and that you will have to ask for ultimately if the overtime law is reenacted?

Mr. CAPT. If there is an extension of the overtime law we will have to ask for additional sums for that purpose.

Mr. LUDLOW. Which will be \$505,000.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; the only additional amount would be \$505,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. \$505,000 additional.

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. So that part of the difference between \$505,000 and \$1,100,000 is included in the \$6,784,000?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir; included in our total estimate we have provided for the payment of \$1,100,000 for overtime in the field.

Mr. O'NEAL. That would all be included but the \$505,000 in the \$6,784,000?

Mr. MOORE. In the \$7,900,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is included?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; included there.

Mr. O'NEAL. So that the amount you would have, if this appropriation is given to you, would be \$7,900,000, plus \$6,784,000 that you are asking for 1946, which would be \$14,684,000, plus \$505,000 which would be for overtime if Public Law 49 is reenacted, and everybody, as a practical matter knows that it is going to be passed, so that you would have had about \$15,000,000 for the whole job, and you have obligated, I understand, \$2,000,000, plus some obligations that you do not know about; is that right?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct.

Mr. O'NEAL. In other words, you would still have available, if this is passed, and if the work is continued, \$13,000,000 more to spend, is that approximately correct, in round figures?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir, depending on your field operations; but you know with the enumeration going on, and with a field cost there of \$8,000,000, that will go very fast, as Mr. Capt has explained.

Mr. CAPT. I am fearful that this \$2,000,000 and something, of obligations that we have here is a pretty misleading figure, because we have tremendous obligations in the field that are not yet cleared, but the money has been spent.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; I understand that.

Most of these enumerators will be recruited from the farms?

Mr. CAPT. Yes; we think we will recruit the enumerators from the farms. We are aiming at the farm families as a source of our enumerators.

CLEARANCE OF PERSONNEL THROUGH UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the U. S. E. S. cover all of those rural employees?

Mr. CAPT. We are required to clear all of our people through the United States employment offices.

Mr. O'NEAL. In each county?

Mr. CAPT. Wherever they have offices.

Mr. O'NEAL. And do they know the families there and the manpower which is available in the locality?

Mr. CAPT. We presume they do.

Mr. O'NEAL. If they know all of those, what is the purpose of taking a farm census, as far as manpower is concerned, if they already have that information?

Mr. CAPT. Well, I do not know what information they have.

Mr. O'NEAL. In other words, you clear through them because they know everybody that is there available for work, and yet one of the main purposes is the recruiting of manpower to know what is available. That looks a little inconsistent to me.

Mr. CAPT. I am fearful that there is some misunderstanding on that, Mr. O'Neal. We clear the employees through the United States Employment Service. I do not know whether they would register with the United States Employment Service before they get there for clearance or not. I am not acquainted with exactly how the United States Employment Service handles their registration, but our people clear through those offices. It may be, as far as I know, that when a prospective enumerator goes into a United States employment office to get clearance, it is the first time they know about him.

Mr. O'NEAL. But, if they do not know whether or not they are employed, how can they give you any real sound advice on the subject?

Mr. CAPT. I am not in a position to say just how the United States Employment Service operates. The fact that we clear through them is all I know.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the Manpower Commission have any information of the type you are seeking here, as far as manpower is concerned?

Mr. CAPT. Before the estimates were set up originally the Budget Bureau cleared with the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, you are seeking information as to manpower; are you not?

Mr. CAPT. In the census?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. CAPT. We are seeking information about the farm census.

Mr. O'NEAL. You made that statement in your opening statement there. That is the reason I mentioned the subject. You mentioned the question of manpower.

Mr. CAPT. Well, I mentioned that we would not cut into the normal labor supply.

Mr. O'NEAL. And you said you have statistics which would be of assistance along that line. You did not contact the Manpower Commission?

Mr. CAPT. Yes; we contacted the Manpower Commission.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does anybody else in the whole Government make any study of the manpower situation on farms or elsewhere?

Mr. CAPT. I am not informed as to what the War Manpower Commission does in that field.

QUESTION OF WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION DOING SIMILAR WORK

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the War Food Administration do work of the type you are undertaking in this census?

Mr. CAPT. Insofar as we know, there is no duplication. Our schedules and inquiries clear through the Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget. We are informed that there is no duplication by any other Government agencies of the job we are working on.

Mr. O'NEAL. You made the statement here that the War Food Administration and other Government agencies did not get that type of information.

Mr. CAPT. No, sir; they do not. They use our records for that.

Mr. O'NEAL. You mean that they have gone all through the war, with all of the agitation we have had, with the great question of controlling prices, and setting ceilings and all of that, and that they are lacking in this information, and that they have had to proceed without that sort of information to base their findings on?

Mr. CAPT. Well, I do not know what information they have got, but I know that they have used information from the Census Bureau beginning with the 1940 figures which we compiled.

Mr. O'NEAL. Do you think they know the acreage of farm land that there is; do you not think that they know the acreage of farm land that there is in this country?

Mr. CAPT. Taking our figures for the 1940 census, they probably do.

Mr. O'NEAL. And they are basing all of this work, and the activity of the War Food Administration has all been based on information which you consider to be inadequate and bad?

Mr. CAPT. No; not entirely. I assume that they have used other information.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is a very serious criticism of what we have done on the question of food control in this country, if it is based on information that you, as an expert, think is not good.

Mr. CAPT. Well, they do not have available only the information which we have. They have available information also from the Department of Agriculture. That Department makes estimates from year to year, but they start with the 1940 census figures. Then they estimate as they go along from month to month and year to year.

Mr. O'NEAL. Do you not think that the War Food Administration knows something about the acreage of the principal crops such as you mentioned here?

Mr. CAPT. They begin with the 1940 census on agriculture, and they take into consideration additional estimates made by the Department of Agriculture. That is, estimates made in their crop estimates from year to year. They have more information than we had in 1940, but that information is rapidly becoming outmoded, and they need new bench-mark data.

Mr. O'NEAL. All the O. P. A. is doing is based on information which is, of course, old and unreliable?

Mr. CAPT. It is the best we can get without further enumerations.

Mr. O'NEAL. You mean they do not know today the number of field or domestic animals on the farms and ranches of the country?

Mr. CAPT. Their estimates are based on the 1940 figures which we collected, plus estimates which are made by the Department of Agriculture from time to time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Then it shocks my confidence in the whole War Food Administration if their information is so bad that we have to spend this money for them to get better information.

CENSUS IS PROVIDED FOR BY LAW

Mr. WOODRUM. This is a census that has to be taken, and is provided for in the permanent law.

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir; it is mandatory.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is mandatory?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is not something you are coming in here now and asking for because you do not consider certain statistical information accurate, but the Congress, by passage of a law, has ordered you to take this census?

Mr. CAPT. Yes, sir. The Director of the Census has no choice in the matter. It is mandatory.

Mr. O'NEAL. My point of view is if another war comes along we will get that same information. Even if it is in the law, I do not see why we should spend money getting the information twice. If we are getting the information, and we certainly must be to do a good job on food, I can see no reason why this committee, if those facts are true, should spend money to take this census now, even though the law says so, when we are spending money for the same purpose in other agencies.

AMOUNT OBLIGATED AND AMOUNT EXPENDED

Mr. WOODRUM. We have quite a large investment in it now. You would not just throw it away, would you?

Mr. O'NEAL. If I had an investment of \$2,000,000 in a thing, and I was going to lose \$14,000,000 more, I would look at it very carefully and consider letting it go.

Mr. WOODRUM. We have more than that in it.

Mr. O'NEAL. The total amount you have spent to date is \$2,000,000 obligated. What else have you spent?

Mr. CAPT. There is a considerable amount of money that has been spent in the field that is not cleared yet, but we are obligated for that.

Mr. O'NEAL. But you know of \$2,000,000 that you have spent.

Mr. CAPT. Yes; that has cleared.

Mr. O'NEAL. Then you know of some more obligations you have, but you do not know exactly what they are.

Mr. CAPT. I would estimate about \$2,000,000 or more.

Mr. O'NEAL. So far as you know of the obligations outstanding, the total sum is \$2,000,000, and your total sum next year will be \$15,000,000. I know in 1929 some of us made the same sort of a mistake. We spent a little money or something we bought, and tried to hold onto it. but sometimes it saves money to take your loss and let it go.

Mr. CAPT. But the \$2,000,000 figure is a misleading figure, as I have said, because there are considerable sums of money that have actually been paid out on pay rolls by the disbursing offices throughout the country, and those amounts have not yet been cleared to us.

Mr. WOODRUM. And there is a lot more obligated. You have employed these supervisors and assistants, and they have claims against the Government?

Mr. CAPT. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Since the question has been raised about the amount obligated and the amount absolutely spent, will you again state the total amount that must actually be expended to take this census? It has been stated that actual work has begun in the field, that not only the State and district or area supervisors have been at work for some time setting up their respective organizations but that the enumerators whom you have thus far been able to secure are at work. Please give the committee the actual cost that has already been obligated.

Mr. MOORE. Just for the enumerators?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am talking about the field operation.

Mr. MOORE. The field operation will cost \$8,808,200.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now, the gentleman from Kentucky has talked about getting information twice. I am not quite clear on that. Is there any evidence before this committee or is it true that you have received the information twice, as has been suggested, or any time since the census of 1940?

Mr. CAPT. No; we have not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. So you have not had any additional information since 1940?

Mr. CAPT. We took a census in 1940 in accordance with the law, and the law now requires it to be taken again in 1945. Whatever information the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture may have is apart from that entirely. I know they make estimates from time to time, but the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture both are eager for this census to be taken.

Mr. O'NEAL. Have they said anything to you about it?

Mr. CAPT. Well, they have requested that it be done, and the Department of Agriculture has gone on record before the Bureau of the Budget urging that this be carried through as rapidly as possible. They get estimates based on crop reports, but these estimates get to the point where they cease to be of much value without new benchmark data. We have to have a complete census brought up to date. This information is not duplicate information, and is not available anywhere else.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Capt, how in the world could our War Food Administration operate if they did not have this type of information?

Mr. CAPT. Well, they have estimates.

Mr. O'NEAL. If they are getting the answer we ought to leave the thing alone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The answer they are getting, as I understand, is an estimate based on accurate and refinite information of the Census Bureau. This new census will keep the Food Administration and the country up to date on the true picture of agriculture. At present the best they could possibly have are estimates. Now, isn't that the situation?

Mr. CAPT. Insofar as it is possible for men to calculate they are as accurate as they can be under the circumstances. That is the best information available, so they must use the best information they have. We are now in the process of trying to get something better for them.

APPOINTMENT OF ENUMERATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I want to discuss with you just a moment the question of how these enumerators are appointed.

Of course, it was charged, when this matter was up before, that it was strictly a political set-up. So I would like to know if you have told your field supervisors or State supervisors to appoint nobody but Democrats, that they must all be appointed on the recommendation of some politician or something like that. I think the committee would like to know about these things.

Mr. CAPT. The instructions that we give to the field staff are that they secure a sufficient number of persons who are qualified to do this work, to give them training, and if they qualify to put them to work. They have instructions to list their needs with the United States Employment Service. They have instructions to confer with the officials of the Department of Agriculture, with local persons, and officials, and with women's clubs, and parent-teachers' associations, and civic bodies and organizations of various kinds in an effort to get people suited for this sort of work. There were never any instructions given to them telling them that they have to take the recommendations from any person or group of persons on the qualifications of anybody. Any person who would like to be an enumerator will be sent to the local supervisor so that he may interview the applicant to determine whether he believes the applicant can do the work. He, the supervisor, makes the appointment in the field.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And he is the only one who has the authority, publicly or privately, to make these appointments?

Mr. CAPT. Yes; he is the only one. Each local supervisor has the authority to appoint enumerators in his own district without reference to anybody else.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad to have that in the record since some of our Republican colleagues have made a political issue out of the taking of the agricultural census, which as I recall, they started in 1925. Members of this committee will recall that there was no serious opposition to this proposal in this committee last fall. But it was suggested that no field force be appointed or set up prior to January 1, 1945, for fear it might be used as a political machine. In fact, such a provision was written into the law. Of course, our Republican brethren evidently thought they would set up a political machine of their own making but it isn't necessary to say it did not materialize.

Now, it so happened that the area supervisor which includes the Sixth Congressional District, is not a politician. He is a newspaperman, and doing an excellent job. I am advised that he cannot possibly finish the job, however, unless given a higher rate for the enumerators. He says, "I am tired of having prospective enumerators laugh at me and walk out when told the ridiculously low rate allowed for the work," and adds, "Many tell me they can make a lot more picking cotton and without spending money for gasoline or using the precious tires."

So it is quite obvious that more funds must be forthcoming or the job cannot be finished and the amount already expended and more that is obligated will have been wasted.

As I see the situation the question of whether or not this work ought to have been started, or the worth of such a census is a little late to discuss at this time. The Congress made the initial appropriation not only pursuant to custom but also pursuant to the law. It is mandatory. Mr. Capt, the Director of the Census, is to be congratulated in attempting to carry out the mandate of the law. He would be derelict in his duty had he done otherwise. However, inasmuch as the job has been started, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that we ought to either quit now and pay off the obligations of the Government and admit that we have failed, or else we ought to give the Census Bureau sufficient funds to do the job and to do it right.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that we should also take into consideration the fact that all agricultural conditions are abnormal at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; that is admitted.

The CHAIRMAN. No former rule would possibly apply to current conditions under the present status, and that in itself renders necessary, if it is at all possible to do it, the establishment of a new basis upon which the industries of the country, not only agriculture but all the industries of the country, and the businessmen of the country could operate and plan for post-war rehabilitation.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that is a very important point, Mr. Chairman.

AMOUNT EXPENDED IN 1940 FOR CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TABER. May I get in a question or two?

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. TABER. How much money was spent on this whole set-up in 1940?

Mr. MOORE. \$9,671,840.

PAY OF ENUMERATORS, AVERAGE COST OF SCHEDULES

Mr. TABER. You told us that the average payment on these sheets would be about 89 cents, plus the 15-percent bonus, which makes somewhere around \$1.02. How many would the average enumerator cover in a day?

Mr. CAPT. The enumerator will cover varying numbers, depending on the territory he works in. In the mountain area, where the roads are bad—

Mr. TABER. What is the average one? This \$1.02 is the average; how many would the average cover?

Mr. CAPT. Based on that 89-cent average price, it would be probably seven or eight schedules a day, more or less; something like that. I have not calculated it but would estimate it would be about that.

Mr. TABER. Would you say eight?

Mr. CAPT. I doubt if they would average eight.

Mr. TABER. Now what do you propose you would pay to those people?

Mr. CAPT. We do not know what we would pay until we get the evidence from each locality where the rate is now considered inadequate.

quate. We might get a request from one area for an increase of 50 percent; from another area, 20 percent; and another area, 80 or 90 percent. So we cannot estimate until we get the evidence from the field forces as to what increases should be accorded, and where.

MR. TABER. Now, is there any information on these sheets that is not already in the possession of the county agents all through the country?

MR. CAPT. The county agents have none of this information.

MR. TABER. None of it?

MR. CAPT. Insofar as we know.

MR. TABER. Well, the county agents in my territory can tell you pretty near what was raised on the farms of any substance, right straight through; they can tell you about the size of them by turning to their records. Now, I do not know what the practice is in other States; but, in my territory, they are right up to snuff on that stuff.

MR. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You mean all of the farms?

MR. TABER. Practically every farm.

MR. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. They do not even have contact with all the farms in my State.

MR. TABER. They do in my territory, and they have had to do a lot more in the last year than they ever have before, with Selective Service. Now, I am wondering what there is on this sheet that the county agents do not already have?

MR. CAPT. Mr. Chairman, of course I am in no position to say what the county agents have, or what their duties are. That would have to come from the Department of Agriculture. But there is set up by law in the Budget Bureau a Division of Statistical Standards through which all questionnaires clear. They there determine whether we ask questions in our Bureau, which are duplications of questions asked by some other agency, or whether we are seeking information already gathered by other agencies.

MR. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administrator have insisted on this job being done?

MR. CAPT. Very strongly.

MR. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That ought to answer your question. If the county agents had this information, why would the Department of Agriculture insist on it being done?

MR. CAPT. They not only insist on it being done, but the Department of Agriculture's representatives have sat with the Bureau of the Census for the major part of last year in developing this schedule. There is no question on here that has not been approved by the Department of Agriculture representatives in committee meetings.

MR. TABER. That is all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dirksen. And may I take advantage of this opportunity to express my great pleasure that Mr. Dirksen has become a member of this subcommittee? We welcome him most heartily.

MR. DIRKSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I presume, Mr. Capt, your schedules have already been prepared?

MR. CAPT. The schedules have already been prepared and are in the field.

MR. DIRKSEN. What date do they call for other than that which is specifically mentioned in the law?

MR. CAPT. There are a series of questions. I can by no means remember all of them, but I would be glad to furnish a copy of the

schedule. Basically, the information we seek is information that is called for in the law, or related to it in such a way that we need it in order to get the complete economic picture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The law says—

A census of agriculture and livestock which will show (1) the acreage of farm land; (2) the acreage of the principal crops; (3) the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country.

That is the limitation in the law, other than the general language that "a census of agriculture and livestock shall be taken." I am wondering if you are carrying any questions on this schedule other than those referred to in the law; if so, can you advise us as to what they are?

Mr. CAPT. All questions on the schedule are questions that have to do directly with those items, or are related to them by administrative interpretation. The statisticians determine what they need in a statistical way, and the questions are pointed toward those statistical needs of the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Have you filed a copy of your schedule for our hearing?

Mr. CAPT. No; we have not. We will be glad to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could that be included at this point in the record, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It may be included at this point.

Mr. CAPT. A copy of the schedule is filed with the Budget Bureau and approved by the Budget Bureau before it is ever released to the printer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it would be good general information to have it in our record, both for the committee and for the Congress.

Mr. CAPT. We will be glad to do that.

(The matter above referred to has been supplied to the Committee.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. How long is this schedule in pages?

Mr. CAPT. I do not remember the number of pages, Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would it be two, four, or six?

Mr. CAPT. Oh, it is six, eight, or more perhaps. It is a columnar schedule; the questions are in columns.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. CAPT. Do you recall how many pages?

Mr. GALLOWAY. There are about 20 farms to a book, and about 10 or 12 pages to a schedule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Ten or twelve pages to a single schedule?

Mr. CAPT. To a book.

Mr. GALLOWAY. One farm would not have to answer all of those questions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What I am trying to get at is this additional cost in relation to the amount of work involved here, and a determination of the reasons why these people are backing off and not undertaking this work. It would occur to me that a rate with overtime which called for \$1.02 a schedule is reasonable remuneration, unless it is an ungodly job of some kind.

Mr. CAPT. It takes considerable time to ask and get answers to the questions. The memory factor comes into that, and sometimes a simple question would require a longer period than you would anticipate, to get the information. The respondent begins to calculate and will

say "Let me see; how many acres did I have in that crop?" "What did I do?"—this and that, and it requires time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When you set down the value of livestock for the United States, who determines the value of the animal?

Mr. CAPT. The farmer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In other words, he gives you a guess as to what his geese, hogs, sheep, and cattle are worth?

Mr. CAPT. Well, we can think of no better source of information than the farmer himself, as to the value of what he has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am wondering about the durable value of the census, for this reason: In 1942—and, Mr. Chairman, you can correct me if I am wrong, but it occurs to me the War Food Administration program called for 120,000,000 pigs, both spring and fall farrowing, and in the following year it was reduced by 17 percent, which would be substantially 22,000,000 pigs. I am wondering about the value of a census where, in 1 year, by Government decree, the amount of hogs raised is reduced from 122,000,000 to less than 100,000,000.

Now, if we are going to have another change right soon, obviously such a latitude would not indicate that the material and information, after you get it, is going to have any great value. And that would be particularly true in wartime, so far as lambs, sheep, calves, and cattle are concerned, I would say.

Mr. CAPT. What the census is designed to do is to get the factual information as of the date it is taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How many schedules would one person do in a day, in a normal farm community like in Illinois, Pennsylvania, Iowa, and Kansas?

Mr. CAPT. I just stated the probable average would be seven or eight schedules a day, in a normal day's work. That number will vary depending on the density of farms, the condition of the roads, distance traveled, and all that sort of thing. The enumerator might take a large number, you might say, in the State of Delaware; he might take a very small number of the State of Idaho—one or two a day, depending on how far he had to drive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After you get these people and hire the men, is this work regarded as essential work; will it be so classified?

Mr. CAPT. I do not know how the War Manpower Commission would classify it, but we did clear with the War Manpower Commission before beginning the census. They made the statement to the Budget Bureau that this work would not interfere with the normal labor supply.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But after you hire them, you cannot assure them, after you have hired and signed the man up, that you are going to keep him.

Mr. CAPT. It will only be for a short period of time. And, of course, he can leave, and the United States War Manpower Commission, or the U. S. E. S. can withdraw him and reassign him.

TAKING CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE MANDATORY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, the law does not make mandatory as to how the census shall be taken; it simply says a census shall be taken.

Mr. CAPT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And it permits you considerable latitude, does it not? The law says:

the Director of the Census may appoint enumerators or special agents for purpose of this section in accordance with the provisions of chapter 1 of this title—

which means the Civil Service Commission's permission. Other than that, there is no method that is mandatory upon you?

Mr. CAPT. No; that is the limit of the direction.

UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES OF AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT IN TAKING
CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, Mr. Capt, have you at any time explored the possibility of utilizing the facilities of the Department of Agriculture for taking this census, because of the critical manpower shortage?

Mr. CAPT. The Department of Agriculture has been cooperating with us. We have called upon them for cooperation and they have given it up to the limit of their ability. Their people are working with us now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would have to go a little further than that. Let me recite for the record, and I do this as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, that for the fiscal year 1945 we allowed the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is the statistical agency, 769 man-years; we allowed the Farm Security Administration, which has a tremendous field force, 9,514 man-years; we allowed the Agricultural Adjustment Administration 4,050 full-time man-years. In addition thereto they are using funds to the extent of \$26,000,000 for 9,093 county committeemen and 104,700 community committeemen. That embraces all of the 48 States of the Union. And to indicate what that group could do; for instance, in a sparsely settled State like Montana, which has only half a million people, there are 993 county committeemen in that State, who contact or live in every one of the counties.

Have you thoroughly explored the possibility of using this tremendous farm set-up in every county of the United States, so as to hold this thing down?

Mr. CAPT. We have called on the Department of Agriculture to list with us the names of any of their crop reporters or other persons with whom they have contact who might be available for this type of work. We assume the Department of Agriculture people who are regularly on the pay roll as annual employees have other duties to perform and might not be available. But as to these people who are employed by the Department of Agriculture on part time as committeemen and crop reporters, we have asked for and obtained from the Department of Agriculture a list of all those people in the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, your assumption may be defensible, but I do not believe your explanation goes far enough in undertaking to hold down expenditures by utilizing this far-flung organization in every county of the United States, which could in the shortest space of time, in my judgment, and with the least dollar expenditure, probably get the information you want on this schedule.

Mr. CAPT. If the Department of Agriculture, or any other department of the Government, did the job, they would still have to pay for

the work. The fact that people are employed by the Department of Agriculture part time as crop reporters, and so forth, would mean when they went on this other work they would still have to be paid, and you would not save any money. Then the people regularly on the Department of Agriculture pay roll are presumably busy all the time—the Department of Agriculture tells us they are—and they cannot take those people off their regular work in order to help us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact is that it is bound to save money, because the amount you just told us the enumerator would get is more than the per diem that the county agents and committeemen get if they would be assigned to that job.

Mr. CAPT. They cannot be assigned to this job and paid by the other department. If they are paid by the other department they would be doing work for the Department of Agriculture; and, if the Department of Agriculture would put them on additional duty, it would have to pay them additional money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I still feel, however, notwithstanding their duties, that here you have a field force and departmental force of 128,000 people who, in a shorter space of time than you can make your set-up, can get the information you want, if that information is nothing more than that required by law, and probably the expenditure could be halved.

I think that is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CAPT. The Department of Agriculture has never indicated to us they would be able to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But you have never indicated to the Department of Agriculture, I take it from your statement here, that you have specifically asked them to come closer in their cooperation with you, and undertake this job.

Mr. CAPT. Oh, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You said you made some suggestions to them.

Mr. CAPT. No; we have asked them specifically and have received from them the names of people whom they employ part time, or with whom they are in contact, or about whom they know, they have given us the names of those people and we are utilizing them to the fullest extent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am still persuaded if this force could be utilized for this relatively large number of enumerators you will employ throughout the country, that they could manifestly do the job and it would be more economical to have them do the job.

Mr. CAPT. But they cannot do this job and perform their regular duties.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On that point, I am not persuaded that it cannot be undertaken.

Mr. CAPT. The Department of Agriculture so informs us. That is what I rest my statement on.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Mr. SNYDER. Just a question or two. First, I might ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen), how many county farm agents did you say you allowed for?

Mr. DIRKSEN. 9,093 county committeemen and 104,700 community in addition to the regular force in triple A, the Farm Security Administration, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. SNYDER. What do you mean by "county committeemen" you allowed for? For instance, in the State of Pennsylvania, every county has what we call a county farm agent, who is paid so much a month, or a year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The county agent, Mr. Snyder, is paid out of joint funds and occupies a wholly different position from a county committeeman, who is on a per diem basis, and is designated by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

NUMBER OF ENUMERATORS SECURED

Mr. SNYDER. Now, in getting these enumerators to take this census, we will say, in the State of Pennsylvania, how many have you gotten; what percent? You were supposed to get them all by December 14, I believe?

Mr. CAPT. We were supposed to go in the field on January 8. That was the date we had set. Up to the present, we are not positive, because we do not have all of the reports in; but, from the reports we have gotten thus far, it looks as though we have gotten about 20 percent of the number of enumerators we need.

PAY OF ENUMERATORS

Mr. SNYDER. And what do you pay for someone to go out here and enumerate these 10 farms out here, say; how much a farm?

Mr. CAPT. The rate of pay is on a piece-price basis; in other words, so much per farm. That rate will vary depending on the density of the farms, road conditions, distance of travel, and that sort of thing.

Mr. SNYDER. I know that, but how much will it vary? It starts out with a minimum of how much?

Mr. CAPT. I guess the lowest rate we have is about 35 cents.

Mr. SNYDER. And what is the highest rate?

Mr. CAPT. It goes up to \$6 in some places.

Mr. SNYDER. Per farm?

Mr. CAPT. Yes—maybe in Idaho or some mountain States where the distance is great and travel is difficult. But the average is around 89 cents, plus 15 percent for so-called overtime.

Mr. SNYDER. A person to do this must have somewhat of an education?

Mr. CAPT. Oh, yes.

Mr. SNYDER. And when you go up to this farm and sit down with the farmer and the farmer's wife, his son, and what not, to take this data, the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I consulted with some of them back home who did this work before, good people, and they do not want to do it now. They may be making three or four times as much a day at whatever they are doing, as they did before, and they do not come under the war effort at all—they may be women, or may be men physically unfit for war work, but who could do this work, but the price is too low, and they cannot get men to go out and do this. It takes them a whole half day at a big farm, sometimes, to do one farm—a whole half day.

Now, what do you propose to pay? Do you want more money to raise those community committeemen from 35 to 60 cents, or what not; is that the idea?

Mr. CAPT. We need money to adjust the rates upward in accordance with the needs of the several localities involved. We might get a recommendation in one which would require increasing the rate 20 percent; in another 50 percent; and in another 60 percent. It just depends on conditions. We do not know the conditions well enough here, and must rely on the local supervisors.

AMOUNT REQUIRED FOR PROGRAM

Mr. TABER. You do not know the situation well enough so that you know how much money it is going to take, do you?

Mr. CAPT. We have to rely on the men on the ground.

Mr. TABER. You are not able to tell us now how much money you want?

Mr. CAPT. We have said what we need; we think we can get the thing done within that limit.

Mr. TABER. But you do not have anything to base it on?

Mr. CAPT. We have the experience of 1935 and 1940, and the experience we have gotten thus far from the field, as indicated from the reports I read to you.

Mr. SNYDER. Have we been taking this census every 5 years for some time back?

Mr. CAPT. The first 5-year census was taken in 1925, I believe.

Mr. SNYDER. That would be 1925, 1930, 1935, and 1940.

Mr. CAPT. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The value to the economy of the Nation as a whole, to the farmers and what not, has been good, has it not?

Mr. CAPT. We think it has been. We do not think that the economic history of the country could have been made complete without it. Statisticians, Government officials, and business and industry interests, all use it continually.

DIFFICULTIES AS RESULT OF TERMINATION OF PROGRAM

Mr. LUDLOW. If this operation is chopped off now, Mr. Capt, what would be your termination difficulties; that is to say, you have many who are employed now and have contracts for space in many buildings?

Mr. CAPT. Yes. We have space contracts out; we have contracts with supervisors to do the job; we have employed area supervisors, local supervisors, and assistant local supervisors, and clerks, telling them the work would last from 4 to 6 or 7 months, as the case may be, depending on the position that the person occupies. We have employed about 20 percent of the enumerators we need, insofar as we can judge from the reports.

Mr. LUDLOW. The most of those are not written contracts, but just oral understandings with the employees; is that right?

Mr. CAPT. It is written to the extent that when each person is appointed he is given an appointment paper. We consider that a contract.

Mr. LUDLOW. In your judgment, would this result in a great flood of claims against the Government if it was just chopped off?

Mr. CAPT. We would probably have protests and claims of one kind and another, from supervisors, particularly.

Mr. O'NEAL. You do not mean they would have a valid claim against the Government, do you?

Mr. CAPT. Not being learned in the law, I do not know how valid they would be, but there probably would be some claims. For example, we entered into an agreement with the supervisor that we would pay him a fixed sum of money, plus a certain sum per farm.

Mr. WOODRUM. For a definite time, to do a definite job?

Mr. CAPT. For the completion of the job.

Mr. WOODRUM. And on the strength of that, many of them bought automobiles and made other financial commitments.

Mr. CAPT. I said to the supervisor, "We will give you \$1,200, plus 1 cent per form for every farm enumerated in your district, for the completion of this job." That, I would consider, to be a contract for the completion of the job.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would there not be some sort of a moral obligation enter into the picture? Where the man is hired for a certain specified time he would not expect to be fired the next day because the Government changes its mind?

Mr. CAPT. I would assume the citizens of the United States would expect their Government to abide by what they thought was intended. I cannot say that from my own knowledge, but I imagine they would.

The CHAIRMAN. What demand is there for this data to be supplied by the census, outside of the census itself?

Mr. CAPT. Business and industry generally need and are eager to get the information. Manufacturers, for example, are certainly interested in farm production, because many of the farm products are used by manufacturers; businessmen, distributors, and marketing people are all interested from the point of view of how much money the farmer has got to buy what they want to sell. They are all eager for this.

PROPORTION OF ENUMERATORS THAT ARE FARMERS

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Capt, what proportion of these enumerators will actually be farmers?

Mr. CAPT. We think the most of them will be, because we aim our recruitment directly at the farm family more than others.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the supervisors?

Mr. CAPT. They may or may not have been farmers. We had to take the people who were available for that type of work, who had the education and general ability to manage and organize. The supervisor is not necessarily a man who must know farming; his primary job is to organize, manage, and direct the efforts of other people. It is largely an organization matter.

The CHAIRMAN. January and February are slack months on the farm, and the enumerators from farm families ought to be able to complete this work before spring opens up.

Mr. CAPT. That has been our experience and is our experience now, that generally there is less work in the wintertime, aside from chores, and that there are certain hours of the day when farm families are free and eager to do this type of work.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Capt.

to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to provide for the erection of a tablet in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution urging the institution of Americans All-Immigrants All program; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 105. Resolution authorizing expenses for the special committee provided for by House resolution 88; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 106. Resolution directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the manner in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is being administered; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Candler Cobb; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman

W. Braun, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Kavanagh; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of John Jehlik; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Kentucky-Illinois Hemp Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Conrad Newman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1789. A bill to provide for the payment of \$20,000 to Clarence Leason Rounds, administrator of the estates of Gerald Rounds, deceased; Richard Gray, deceased; Virginia Grafton, deceased; and Geraldine Titus, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1791. A bill to alter the service record of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1793. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Micker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Saldana Agosto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1798. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. Flohl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1802 (by request). A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Weber; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

37. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

38. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition signed by women of Waterloo, Iowa, protesting the ruling of the War Labor Board declaring the brewery industry essential to the war effort and protesting any form of peacetime conscription of youth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. By the Speaker: Petition of the Insular League of Parent Teacher Associations of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the requested liquidation of the colonial system of government in Puerto Rico, and the right of Puerto Ricans to adopt their own form of government; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

January 25, 1945

next peace conference. After the war is won it may be too late to ask about the future of Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, the Ruhl Valley, Korea, or even that of our ally, China.

Those men on the fighting fronts, men whose service stripes show that they have been away from home 2, 2½, and even 3 years, think it is about time that they and their loved ones knew that there will not be a repetition of this horrible mess as soon as their sons are old enough to fight. They do not know it today. They are not convinced by the statements or the inferences from high sources that everything will be all right. They know that it is not all right today, after 3 years in which America as a good ally has sent the best that she has in men and material wherever they are needed, without regard to costs, either in lives or in dollars. They want to see the United States stand vigorously for a world partnership in which all nations, big and small, will operate through the orderly processes of international law. They think it will not be sufficient to depend upon British and Russian need for United States assistance after the war to insure their cooperation in the peace conference.

The G. I. in Southampton, St. Germaine, and Luxemburg wants the President of the United States to be practical, realistic, and if necessary, tough. He believes in his President. He is proud of him. He is proud of the regard which the peoples of the world have for President Roosevelt. The G. I. knows that his President is one of the great Americans of all time. He knows that in his hands, more than in those of any other man alive today, rest the chances of freedom, health, happiness, and opportunity for little people in our time. That is a fearful responsibility. And the G. I. is a little worried about Mr. Roosevelt's determination or lack of determination to out talk Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin on matters of world policy. He knows that Mr. Roosevelt seeks to advance American ideals and leadership by open and free cooperation with the other Allied powers, but he is beginning to wonder if the other powers are playing ball by those rules. He thinks the American team had better begin to think more about the final score and less about the rules.

These men know that many of their number will not come back, and that there will be others who will never be whole again. They know at what a terrific rate the attrition of the western front is burning out men, but they do not think of those things. They are not afraid of those things. What they fear is futility. They fear that the great effort they and their Nation are making, that the great cost and waste of World War No. 2 may be futile. Their President can dispel that fear. We at home can help him dispel it.

Because of the things I have said, the inference may be drawn that I am concerned about the morale of the American soldier abroad. In answer to that I point simply to the fighting spirit of the men who stopped Rundstedt's breakthrough. Military men know that sheer

will power and fighting hearts and those alone stopped Rundstedt. G. I.'s stood in their tracks and took the full weight of that armored onslaught with rifles and bayonets and hand grenades, or whatever weapons were at hand. They slowed it, and then they stopped it, when only a few miles farther lay the rich prizes for which Rundstedt had driven. A little less courage, a little less willingness to stand and hold and die, and disaster could have come to the Allied forces on the western front. It takes morale to do what those G. I.'s did. It takes G. I. guts.

All that I have said is in an effort to make them stronger, to help to pay the debt which I and every American owe to our fighting men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

137. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting an amended certificate from the executive of Arizona, certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in that State on November 7, 1944, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1760. A bill providing for Federal aid to States for the acquisition of toll bridges; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 1761. A bill to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1762. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 1763. A bill to provide for making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for soil and water conservation work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1764. A bill to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1765. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and

Mechanic Arts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1766. A bill to provide for retirement of reservists of the present war at the highest rank held in active service during such war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 1767. A bill to authorize the construction and operation and maintenance of the initial unit of the Mountain Home project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1768. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1769. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been killed in action in World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1770. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 with respect to the retired pay of certain commissioned officers of the Army retired for disability during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1771. A bill to amend section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved August 29, 1935, relative to death benefits, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1772. A bill regulating the amount of interest to be paid by insolvent or alleged insolvent banks in liquidation or in the hands of receivers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1773 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1774. A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of superhighways, three east and west and six north and south highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1775. A bill to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1776. A bill to create uniformity in the application of revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1777. A bill to provide free transportation for parents or wives on Government-owned ships and aircraft to the graves of veterans buried abroad; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1778. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Smith River and its tributaries, California and Oregon, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1779. A bill to provide for the regulation of civilian employment to aid in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced

H. J. RES. 85

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 25, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri introduced the following joint resolution; which
was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945
for the Census of Agriculture.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That the amount named in the appropriation contained in
- 4 the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, for
- 5 preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quin-
- 6 quennial Census of Agriculture of the United States is hereby
- 7 increased by \$6,784,000.

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 85

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the
fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri

JANUARY 25, 1945

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

3. NOMINATION. It is understood that the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee plans to hold public hearings, beginning Tues., on the nomination of Aubrey Williams to be Rural Electrification Administrator (Wash. City News Service).

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Mon., Feb. 5.

HOUSE

4. AGRICULTURAL-CENSUS APPROPRIATION. Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 85, appropriating \$6,784,000 additional (same as Budget estimate) for the census of agriculture (H. Rept. 52) (p. 794). The committee report states that the appropriation is necessary "if the job is to be prosecuted completely and successfully."
5. FARM LABOR. Reps. Hoffman, Mich., Sparkman, Ala., Phillips, Calif., and others opposed the drafting of essential farm labor and discussed the possible effect on food production. Rep. Hoffman inserted several communications on this subject. (pp. 785-93.)
6. DAIRY INDUSTRY; FARM LABOR. Rep. Hill, Colo., stated that it looks as though many dairy farmers are "going to have to sell" their herds because of the lack "of experienced help" in view of the induction of farm labor into the armed forces, and inserted a Denver Milk Producers' resolution on this subject (p. 778).
7. FEDERAL LOAN AGENCIES. Rep. Cochran, Mo., urged that S. 375, the George RFC-Commerce separation bill, be referred to the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee, but the Speaker referred the bill to the Banking and Currency Committee (p. 776).
8. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 5 (p. 793).

BILLS INTRODUCED

9. PERSONNEL. H.R. 1968, by Rep. Rees, Kans., to provide, in the case of certain Government employees dying after Sept. 18, 1939, for payment of accrued annual leave due at the time of death, and H.R. 1969 to extend certain benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act to employees with not less than 5 years' service. To Civil Service Committee. (p. 794.) Remarks of author (p. 780).
10. FLAG DISPLAY. H. J. Res. 92, by Rep. Sadowski, Mich., to authorize the President to proclaim Oct. 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 794.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

11. MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY. Rep. Cochran, Mo., inserted F.V. Heinkel's Missouri Farmer article favoring the establishment of an MVA based on a plan similar to the TVA (p. A458).
12. FISHERIES. Rep. Angell, Oreg., inserted a Harpers Magazine article regarding the "great salmon experiment" on the Columbia River (pp. A459-61).
13. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Horan, Wash., inserted Dr. F.O. Kreager's address concerning the need for highway construction in the Northwest States to, among other things, aid in trade development and processed food distribution (pp. A457-8).

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued February 3, 1945, for actions of Friday, February 2, 1945)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	8	Flag display.....	10	National service.....	19
Appropriation.....	4	Foreign relief.....	14	Nomination.....	3
Banking and currency....	15	Labor, farm.....	2,5,6,18	Personnel.....	9,19
Census of agriculture....	4	Loans.....	7	T.V.A.....	20
Commodity Credit.....	1	Military training.....	17	Taxation.....	16,20
Dairy industry.....	6	Missouri River		Transportation.....	13
Electrification.....	3	basin.....	11,21,22		
Fisheries.....	12				

SENATE

1. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. S. 298, as reported from the Senate Banking and Currency Committee (see Digest 19) provides as follows: Increases CCC's borrowing power by \$1,500,000,000. Authorizes CCC, if the War Food Administrator finds that there is danger of spoilage of any non-basic perishable commodity owned or controlled by CCC, to sell or cause to be sold such commodity below parity or comparable price, but requires such sales to be made, insofar as practicable, so as to prevent depression of farm prices. Suspends, until two years after January 1 immediately following the end of the war, the restrictions on the sale of cotton in Sec. 381(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Makes inapplicable to CCC, for the fiscal year 1946, the prohibition in the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944 against subsidies, etc., but limits the CCC subsidies as follows: Permits payments (1) to complete operations for 1944 and prior-year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and in amounts not over \$250,000,000 during the last half of 1945 for the dairy production payment program, \$60,000,000 during that period for other noncrop programs, and \$225,000,000 for the 1945 crop programs. Permits continuation of the subsidies (on a comparable basis) during the following six months if the war has not ended, but prohibits additional subsidy obligations if the war ends during the first half of 1946. Provides for annual appraisals of CCC assets as of June 30 (now March 31), on the basis of the lower of average market price during the last month of the fiscal year or cost (now the lower of cost, including not more than one year's charges, or average market prices for 12 months before appraisal). Continues CCC as a Government agency from June 30, 1945, until June 30, 1947.
2. FARM LABOR. It is understood that a subcommittee of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee has been formed to formulate a statement of the position of the Committee regarding the drafting of farm labor, for transmission to the Military Affairs Committee. It is also understood that the Military Affairs Committee has approved clarifying language in the manpower bill to make it more certain that the Tydings amendment will not be affected. (Wash. City News Service.)

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN
COMMERCE

(Tuesday, February 6, 1945)

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 6, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND
FISHERIES

(Thursday, February 15, 1945)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

166. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 616 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of the rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1962. A bill to incorporate the American Veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1963. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey with a view to establishing a lock system for passage between Grand Traverse Bay on Lake Michigan,

and Torch Lake, Antrim County, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:

H. R. 1964. A bill to incorporate the American Veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1965. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 1966. A bill to establish an American Mothers Memorial Commission to prepare plans and estimates of costs for the construction in the District of Columbia of a national memorial to the mothers of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1967. A bill providing for the promotion of certain substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1968. A bill to provide, in the case of certain Government employees dying after September 18, 1939, for payment for accumulated or accrued annual leave due at the time of death; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1969. A bill to extend certain benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act to employees with not less than 5 years' service who are voluntarily separated from the service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1970. A bill to amend title 11 of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act for military service by providing for adjustment of benefits received under such title in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1971. A bill relating to the amount which may be paid in connection with the settlement of accounts of deceased members of the armed forces without the appointment of a legal representative of the estate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1972. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1973. A bill to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to create a commission to prepare plans for the estab-

lishment of a school for the training of women for service as commissioned officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 1976. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Edith M. Carney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Jay H. McCleary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Maj. Edward A. Zaj; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Cyriel Pequ, also known as Carl Smith; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1982. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr., Edward Gray, Jr., Bertha Mae Gray, Bertha Patmon, and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hantrameck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

47. Mr. WELCH presented California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, relating to memorializing Congress to enact a seamen's bill of rights, which was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

So all of this talk, all of this furor, is only over the need for 330,000 men as a maximum.

The point I contend has not been discussed fully, is this matter of going back to the farms to take men. Here is a dairy in my district. The last milker is gone. Forty more milk cows have gone into the beefsteaks that we get in the restaurants. Here is a 400-acre farm in the Dakotas. That farm is closed. There is no argument about it. That is distinctly against the terms of the Tydings amendment.

Therefore, is it not right for us, Mr. Speaker, and the Congress of the United States, to say that that is not the only source for 300,000 men at the present time? There are 11,900,000 men and women who have been taken and kept in the armed services. There have been about 13,500,000 men drafted into the services. Enough of those have been released to leave a balance of 11,900,000; 7,225,432 are abroad at the present time. That leaves in uniform in the United States, perfectly physically capable men who want to serve, who either enlisted or were drafted to serve, 4,674,518 men.

Can we stand here today and say that out of 4,000,000 men physically capable, drafted, trained, ready to go, there are not 300,000 men who can be sent as replacements to the fighting armies in all the areas in which we are fighting? Many of you have sons in the service, many of you have friends in the camps, and you know exactly what I know, that there is available manpower in the camps today that is not used by the War Department and not used by the Navy Department more than all the number that we are talking about in these discussions over the need of drafting farm labor.

We also know—and it was admitted by General Hershey—that there are 2,000,000 civilian employees in the War Department today. There is available in the United States adequate manpower without even touching the factories which were under discussion yesterday. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I add to the gentleman's statistics the fact that the Department of Commerce has recently released a document which shows that approximately 4,000,000 people have left the farms of the United States since the commencement of the war. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has been one of the leaders in Congress in the effort to produce a sufficiency of food. He undoubtedly can confirm this statement as to the drifting away from the farms of much needed manpower.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Three and one-half million plus.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I further relate this occurrence which came to my attention yesterday: I was advised that a lady whose husband was killed in a defense plant last year had as her only assistant on the farm an 18-year-old son. That son now has been informed by the local draft board that he must go into the service on the 15th of February. Two of the board members wanted the boy to stay on the farm, but the third, evidently one who dominates the board, argued that the word of the President superseded the Tydings amendment. That farm will be out of business, as this lady cannot do all of the farm work herself, and another sale will shortly add another farm to those closed out by a very short-sighted policy. Does not this boy have the right of appeal under the present law?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a point I wanted to bring to your attention. When these men go to the draft boards and are put through this preinduction test and come back, they are told that the right of appeal is no longer theirs.

You say it is not possible. Of course, it is not possible. It is no more possible than the old story of the man who was in jail, and his lawyer said, "Why, they can't put you in jail for that." "But," he says, "here I am." That is exactly what the draft boards are doing today in many States. They are saying that the man does not have the right of appeal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I add with respect to the number of Government employees that out of the 3,400,000 civilian employees on the Government pay roll 400,000 are serving outside the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We would not even have to pay transportation on them if the gentleman from Alabama will observe the figure.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman says the furor is over the 350,000. I think the furor is more over the violation of the Tydings amendment than over the number of men affected by it, the violation of the express law of the land and its being set aside by what appears to be a dictatorial power.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that all the men who have left the farm were drafted, or does he believe that some of them might have left the farm to get a reasonable wage?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not only "some of them." We have just as many people in agriculture who do things that hurt agriculture as you have in industry or anywhere else. A man goes down to the draft board and gets himself an IV-F status. He can go back on the farm and get the normal farm wage, which is all

the farmer can afford to pay, just about four times what it was previous to the war, or he can walk over into one of the manufacturing plants and get up to \$100 a week for about one-third of the work. Which do you think he is going to do? Had we put teeth in the draft law so the boards could say, "All right, you are deferred; stay on the farm; fine."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We are told that food will win the war and write the peace, and the farmers have been urged to produce in abundance. It seems to me one of the troubles we are up against is that those who made that statement and who are running the war do not recognize the production of food as an essential industry, just as essential, at least, as the manufacture of war materials.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not merely as an essential industry but one which they now classify, a subclassification of a classification, as "critically essential." I should like the gentleman, who knows a great deal more about this than I do and is an authority on it, to say just what he thinks of this business of nice productive agricultural seasons year after year, after year after year. Nature is working on the side of the Allies, and I hope she continues to do so, but how long does the gentleman think we are going to have these exceptional growing seasons?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We may not have them any more, but certainly on the dairy farms and the other farms we must have skilled manpower to produce the food. They passed a bill here yesterday to provide men for certain war industries, not agriculture but war industries, where the men will possibly be taken out of agriculture to be placed in these industries, causing a greater reduction in the production of food.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on William Penn, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer that it will entail an additional cost of \$102.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 375. An act to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1945, FOR THE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

FEBRUARY 2, 1945.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. J. Res. 85]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) entitled "Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture," reports the measure with a favorable recommendation for its early consideration and passage by the House.

The Budget estimate upon which the joint resolution is based was submitted by the President on January 17, 1945 (H. Doc. 33), in the sum of \$6,784,000, and that is the amount which the committee recommends be appropriated.

Starting with 1925, there has been a quinquennial census of agriculture and livestock showing the acreage of farm land, acreage of principal crops, the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country, and other worth while related information which otherwise would not be available. Duplication of data available to or gathered by other Federal agencies is avoided through controls exercised by the Statistical Standards Division of the Bureau of the Budget.

Rapid changes in the national economy over the past 5 years have made the bench-mark data from the 1940 census of limited value for administrative operations or other uses. There is a pressing need for reasonably accurate and up-to-date statistics on food supplies on hand and of food-production possibilities in the United States for more effectively and efficiently programing for war needs, for the needs of our civil population, for the needs of our allies, and for the needs of the peoples of reoccupied countries, to say nothing of the need for the availability, as and when the peace nears, for up-to-date and reasonably accurate data bearing upon farm economy for the guidance of

2 ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION, 1945, FOR CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Government and business in meeting the problems which reconversion will entail. There is a widespread demand for such data by commercial enterprises and other nongovernmental agencies, according to the testimony.

The Congress recognized the need and worth of this census in voting an appropriation of \$650,000 for its initiation in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944. Later, in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, an appropriation of \$7,250,000 was provided, which, at that time, was deemed to be sufficient for the accomplishment of the whole project. Such latter appropriation reads as follows:

Census of agriculture: For all expenses necessary for preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quinquennial Census of Agriculture of the United States, including the employment by the Director, at rates to be fixed by him, of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the civil service and classification laws; books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; construction of tabulating machines; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the collection of statistics, when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary; printing and binding; \$7,250,000, to be available until December 31, 1946, and to be consolidated with the appropriation "Census of Agriculture" contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be expended for field work in connection with such census prior to January 1, 1945.

Since the foregoing item became law, it has developed that enumerators are unwilling to engage their services at the pay rates used in arriving at the estimate upon which such appropriation was based. Actual experience indicates that considerably higher rates will need to be paid, and this unlooked-for turn makes necessary an additional appropriation of \$6,784,000, if the job is to be prosecuted completely and successfully. The earlier appropriation contemplated average compensation, per schedule, of from 50 to 60 cents. The new average, per schedule, is 89.8 cents.

Thus far, field offices have been established, local or district supervisors have been employed and trained, and field enumeration has commenced on a limited scale. Greater progress has been hindered because to proceed on a full scale of operation at the compensation rates being demanded would force the incurrence of a deficiency, which would be in violation of law. Expenditures and obligations to date, which must be liquidated, run well in excess of \$2,000,000; possibly as much as \$4,000,000. It is either a case of losing that investment or supplementing the funds previously appropriated to the extent of the instant proposal.

If provision be made for the payment of appropriate compensation, competent enumerators in sufficient numbers, it has been represented to the committee, can be found among people so situated as not to be available for regular employment. The chief source would be members of farm families: First preference, however, will be given to honorably discharged veterans, members of their families, and members of the families of men still in the service. The committee has been assured that the project will not interfere in any way with the war program. All appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service, and, of course, may not be employed if needed and available for war work.

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 85

[Report No. 52]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 25, 1945

MR. CANNON of Missouri introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

FEBRUARY 2, 1945

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That the amount named in the appropriation contained in
- 4 the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, for
- 5 preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quin-
- 6 quennial Census of Agriculture of the United States is hereby
- 7 increased by \$6,784,000.

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 85

[Report No. 52]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri

JANUARY 25, 1945

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

FEBRUARY 2, 1945

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

February 5, 1945.

-3-

year funds."

Civil Service Commission. "For salaries and expenses for...regular activities, the Budget estimate proposes \$10,016,000, an increase of \$1,342,118 over the 1945 appropriation with overtime compensation deducted... The committee recommends a reduction of \$503,480 in the Budget estimate and has allocated deductions among functions under the various project heads as follows: ...Work improvement program, \$106,678; promoting better personnel management, \$76,400; preparing and issuing standards - field classification work, \$229,810; ...While the total recommended by the committee for regular activities represents an increase of approximately \$840,000 over the 1945 appropriation, this increase is more than offset by a reduction of \$2,639,465 in national defense activities, the 1946 Budget indicating a trend to regular activities which may or may not be justified in the light of future events.

"Civil Service Retirement Fund. - Attention is invited to the necessity for an increase of \$50,500,000 in the current appropriation... The amount recommended...represents...the amount determined by the Board of Actuaries as necessary to keep the fund in a sound financial condition."

Public-works planning, pursuant to the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act: "The committee recommends an initial appropriation of \$5,000,000...The committee is of the opinion that this project should be undertaken on a much smaller scale than is proposed in the Budget estimate and that progress should be made slowly until a fairly accurate picture can be obtained from the States as to what the demand will be for works of this type. While the committee is in favor of post-war planning it believes that every precaution should be taken to prevent the approval of 'high pressure' projects."

General Accounting Office. "Aside from a reduction...for penalty mail, the committee has approved the total Budget estimate...for...this Office...The total basic increase...\$1,690,253."

2. AAA ALLOTMENTS. Agriculture Committee reported with amendment S. 338, to protect the allotments of farmers who have shifted to war crops or are serving in the armed forces (H. Rept. 55)(p. 864).
3. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE. Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. J. Res. 85, appropriating \$6,784,000 additional for the census of agriculture (pp. 839-40, 864).
4. BUTTER SHORTAGE. Rep. Woodruff, Mich., criticized the butter situation and inserted a letter and resolution from the Remus Co-operative Creamery Co. requesting OPA and WFA to reconsider present price policies to remove "discrimination against butterfat producers" (p. 840).
5. FARM LABOR. Reps. Hale, Maine; Knutson, Minn.; and Hoffman, Mich., criticized the drafting of farm labor, and other members discussed this with them (pp. 841, 852-5, 856-9). Rep. Cooley, S. C., discussed action taken by Gen. Hershey to clarify the farm-labor situation (pp. 861-3).
6. DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN. Rep. Voorhis, Calif., criticized the Government's use of such employees; urged consideration of his bill H. R. 148, to forbid their employment; and cited an example (not Agriculture) upon which his objections are based (pp. 849-52).

7. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Rep. McDonough, Calif., criticized the sale of surplus property "for practically nothing" (p. 863).
8. FLOOD CONTROL. Received the War Department's report on the St. Johns Levee District, Mo. To Flood Control Committee. (p. 864.)

SENATE

9. COMMODITY CREDIT. Passed as reported, S. 298, to continue CCC as a U. S. agency, to increase its borrowing power, etc. (pp. 818-21). (For the bill's provisions, see Digest 20.)
10. FARM LABOR. Sen. McCarran, Nev., criticized the drafting of farm labor and inserted his letter to WFA together with constituents' letters on the subject (pp. 801-3).
Agriculture and Forestry Committee returned S. J. Res. 19, providing for an investigation of certain phases of the farm-labor draft program. It was referred to the Military Affairs Committee in view of their work on a bill dealing with that subject. (pp. 805-6.)
Sen. Revercomb, W. Va., for himself and Sen. Robertson, Wyo., and Taft, Ohio, submitted amendments which they intend to propose to S. 36, to amend the Sec. 5(k) relating to the drafting of farm labor, of the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940 (p. 806).
11. ALCOHOL INDUSTRY INVESTIGATION. Rejected, 43-28, Sen. McCarran's (Nev.) motion to discharge the Audit-Control Committee from consideration of S. Res. 17, to continue the investigation of the alcoholic-beverage industry (pp. 811-7).
Sen. McCarran criticized the failure of the Audit-Control Committee to report the resolution (p. 812).
12. PURCHASING. Received the Office of Contract Settlement's second quarterly progress report. To Military Affairs Committee. (p. 798.) Sen. Thomas, Utah, inserted the report in the Record (p. 807).
13. PENALTY MAIL. Received the Postmaster General's report of the estimated number of pieces of mail mailed under the penalty mail privilege during the quarter ended Sept. 30, 1944, showing the estimated number of pieces mailed, and the estimated cost to the Post Office Department of the handling of these mailings (by departments and agencies). To Post Offices and Post Roads Committee. (p. 797.)
14. LANDS. Received Interior's 1944 report relative to the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity. To Public Lands and Surveys Committee. (p. 797.)
Received Interior's statement showing withdrawals and restorations of public lands made during 1944. To Public Lands and Surveys Committee. (p. 797.)
15. EDUCATION. Received Office of Education's annual report for fiscal year 1944. To Education and Labor Committee. (p. 798.)
16. BANKRUPTCY. Received the Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts' tables of bankruptcy statistics with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the U. S. district courts during the fiscal year 1944. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 798.)

PERMITTING THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION AND UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION TO PAY THE TAX IMPOSED UNDER SECTION 1410 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1429) to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the \$3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a short explanation of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 1429 has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It was introduced and considered at the request of Admiral Land, Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and is designed to overcome an administrative problem in that agency during the war period.

The War Shipping Administration is required by law to pay the employers' tax of 1 percent on the pay roll of seamen in its employ for old-age benefits under the Social Security Act. Existing law requires that the War Shipping Administration pay such tax only on the first \$3,000 of wages paid to a seaman during a year, but in order for the Administration to observe this limitation it would be necessary to establish a large and expensive bookkeeping division here in Washington. Admiral Land believes, and the committee agrees, that it is more practical and economical, during the war period, to permit him to pay the 1 percent tax on amounts above \$3,000, and not make claim for refund, than to establish the expensive bookkeeping division, which would otherwise be necessary, when not only manpower but also business machines are difficult to secure.

Under the bill there would be an estimated net saving of \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina has covered the situation very clearly.

Law enacted in 1943 placed service of seamen in the employ of the War Shipping Administration within covered employment of Social Security Act for purpose of old age survivors' insurance.

Benefits are financed by equal taxes on the employer and employee. The taxes are based on the employee's wages up to \$3,000 and not in excess of \$3,000 received in any 1 year.

Administration of old-age and survivors' insurance necessitates maintaining

a continuous wage record under a separate account number for each employee until he is eligible for benefits. Every 3 months employers report the amount of each employee's wages, with his account number, to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, when they pay the employer's and employee's taxes. The Bureau forwards these reports to the Social Security Board, where each employee's wages are recorded to his account.

This bill, H. R. 1429, is to overcome an administrative difficulty relating to the War Shipping Administration which has no means to determine when a seaman in its employ has reached the \$3,000 limit with respect to employment in a particular calendar year.

Vessels are operated through designated agents referred to as general agents. He selects the crew for each vessel and its supplies. He pays off the crew at the end of the voyage after making tax deductions. Men he hires are not his employees; they are employees of the War Shipping Administration.

This bill, H. R. 1429, eliminates the application of the \$3,000 limitation as to taxable wages. It may lead to overpayment of taxes by the Shipping Administration, but will in no way adversely affect the benefits of the employees.

To operate a central wage record unit to enforce the \$3,000 wage limitation would cost \$150,000 to \$200,000.

The estimated additional taxes which, under the bill, the War Shipping Administration might have to pay in wages in excess of \$3,000 would probably not exceed \$100,000—a saving of \$50,000.

Calculating machinery is not available to set up a central wage unit to keep the records to insure the enforcement of the \$3,000 limitation.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. A special division would have to be set up by the Government and the Government would lose about \$60,000 per annum.

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I can appreciate the difficulty which the Maritime Commission may be having in collecting their tax. Does the Ways and Means Committee ever think of the difficulties they have placed on manufacturers and business people of this country not only in collecting that tax but taxes they are forcing the employer to collect today? I want to say that as an employer of labor, the duties that are imposed upon manufacturing concerns today by the new tax laws are most difficult, and they are supposed to be so exact. With the labor shortages in many establishments in this country, I hope the Ways and Means Committee will find some way of simplifying the duties which are being imposed upon the business people of this country. It will be necessary to do that if you expect the business people to continue in business.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I may say to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania that at the time we consider the next tax bill we will be pleased to have the gentleman appear before our committee. There are obvious difficulties.

Mr. RICH. I will be glad to do that. Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. But that is in no way involved in the present bill.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but this gives me an opportunity to call the attention of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of that committee to the matter. I have the greatest respect for the chairman of that committee and I hope that that committee in the future will try to find some way of giving relief to the people of this country that we are forcing to collect the greatest amount of taxes that has ever been collected. They have a problem now to face.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We are all having that problem, I may say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 1426 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, and their agents or persons acting on their behalf or for their account, may, for convenience of administration, make payments of the tax imposed under section 1410 without regard to the \$3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1), but they shall not be required to obtain a refund of the tax paid under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code on that part of the remuneration of seamen in their employ not included in wages by reason of section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code."

(b) The amendments made by this act shall be effective as if made by section 1 (b) (1) of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes", approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law 17, 78th Cong.; 57 Stat. 45).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION—1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 120, Rept. No. 56), which was referred to the House Calendar and order to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an

(over)

additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered on tomorrow, I may have permission to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a colloquy I had with Bob Evans, C. B. S. reporter, over WFBL at Syracuse recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a man operating a cooperative creamery, also a resolution adopted by the board of that creamery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SCARCITY OF FOODSTUFFS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we who buy our groceries in Washington have reasons to know there are shortages in many foodstuffs essential to our well-being. One of the most valuable food products we have is butter, and anyone within the sound of my voice who has had occasion to do the family marketing knows how difficult it is to find a pound, half pound, or even a quarter of a pound of butter for sale.

I assume one can buy all the butter and other scarce foods he desires if he wishes to contact the black market. I do not indulge in that reprehensible practice myself. Consequently we do not always have butter in our household.

Whenever conditions in this life are not what they should be, there usually are reasons why such conditions prevail. This definitely is true of the butter situation, which I assume is much the same throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, in the town of Remus, Mich., one of the thriving little localities in my congressional district, the Remus Cooperative Creamery Co. has for many years been doing a very splendid business, thereby contributing to the welfare of the community and the country. On Saturday last I received a letter from the manager of this creamery company, Mr. Ted Baumann, and in this letter he discusses the conditions which exist in that part of Michigan. I again assume the same conditions prevail elsewhere in the State and the Nation. Mr. Baumann discusses this question in a way most illuminating, and, I believe, points directly to the things which are responsible for the prevailing shortage of butter. Mr. Baumann's letter is so lucid and covers the whole question so completely that each Member of this House should have an opportunity to see for himself what the present situation is and what it demands.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing Mr. Baumann's letter, together with a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the stockholders of this splendid company. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Baumann has put his finger squarely upon the things that must be done if we wish to return to a normal production of this very important food commodity, and thus relieve the present unfortunate situation.

REMUS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,

Remus, Mich., January 31, 1945.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: Under present conditions with the price of whole milk, sold for manufacturing purposes, bringing the farmers who are able to sell whole milk, a high premium over that received by farmers who are selling cream for manufacturing butter, we find ourselves making 25 percent less butter than a few years ago and our very existence jeopardized.

This discrepancy in the price has brought on a condition, whereby the average consumer cannot find butter unless he knows or has a friend in the retail butter business or patronizes the black market.

It is, also, causing a glut on the market of certain manufactured products which is unnecessary and uncalled for. Indirectly it is discouraging farmers from raising hogs, thereby causing a shortage of meat products.

It is creating a serious condition that may well cause serious loss to the dairy industry for many years after this war is won, because butter is the balance wheel of the industry, and, as such, must not be completely destroyed. It has forced many creameries to close their doors, thereby depriving those who have no other outlet for their product a market for their cream. It is causing those who have no available market for their whole milk a serious financial loss.

With the foregoing conditions handicapping many of our 3,000 patrons—at one time we were serving 4,000 farmer patrons—as well as causing serious handicaps to the creamery, action was taken at our annual stockholders meeting and a resolution was passed which is designed to increase the price of butterfat sold to creameries for manufacturing butter, and to equalize the dairy feed subsidy paid to the producers of butterfat for butter manufacturing, so that the relationship between prices received by farmers who sell cream to creameries and that received by farmers who are able to sell whole milk will be more nearly equal.

I am forwarding a copy of the resolution passed and ask your cooperation in securing an adjustment in the price of butter, which will encourage a higher production of butterfat and thus relieve the serious shortage of butter which in turn will ease the shortage of fats for our war effort.

Cordially yours,

REMUS CO-OPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
TED BAUMANN, Manager.

Whereas butter production in the creameries of the country is decreasing to an alarming extent; and

Whereas this appears to be due to a price differential established by the War Food Administration and Office of Price Administration which favors production of processed milk in the form of powdered, condensed, and evaporated milk by establishing a price to the producer for his whole milk which encourages the sale of whole milk and discourages the sale of cream to creameries on a butterfat basis; and

Whereas the feed subsidy to milk producers is based on 100 pounds of raw milk irrespective of its butterfat content, while producers who separate milk and sell the cream to the creamery receive their subsidy on the basis of butterfat content which at the present time places a premium on sale of whole milk and discriminates against the average producer who sells cream; and

Whereas the present tendency of producers to discontinue the sale of cream to creameries and to sell instead to processors of whole milk is a factor in decreasing pork production since there is therefore less skim milk available as food for pigs and hogs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Remus Cooperative Creamery Co. protest the present ceilings and subsidies and request the War Food Administration and Office of Price Administration to make a new study of conditions referred to in these resolutions, and to so adjust ceiling and subsidies that the discrimination against butterfat production for butter production be eliminated and dairy farmers encouraged to produce cream for sale to creameries, with the object of removing the factors contributing to the butter shortage and encouraging production of an increased supply of butter for the consumer; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the War Food Administration and to the Office of Price Administration, to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF, Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, Congressman ALBERT J. ENGEL, and Congressman FRED BRADLEY.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

entitled "Arms for Russia" by Ernest Lindley. It is important, I think, that the Russian people know how much we have done in the matter of supplying their country with arms.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted (at the request of Mr. VINSON) to Messrs. IZAC, SAESSER, RIVERS, HEBERT, MADDEN, HAVENNER, DE LACY, BIE-MILLER, MOTT, COLE of New York, BATES of Massachusetts, HESS, ANDERSON of California, GRANT of Indiana, TOWE, ELLIOTT, and PINERO on account of official business for the Naval Affairs Committee in connection with an inspection of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills).

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 63. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 72. An act for the relief of Antonio Ruiz; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 184. An act to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment-compensation agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 243. An act for the relief of Galen E. Walter; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 294. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 311. An act for the relief of Philip Kleinman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 312. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Richards; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 314. An act for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolína Thordardóttir; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 375. An act to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Tuesday, February 6, 1945)

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 6, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Wednesday, February 7, 1945)

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold an organization meeting at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 7, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Thursday, February 15, 1945)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXVI, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

167. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on rec-

ord proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

168. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 29, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the lower Mississippi River, with a view to determining whether additional flood protection should be provided for the St. Johns Levee District, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 16, 1943; to the Committee on Flood Control.

169. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, which the War Department recommends be enacted into law; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 119. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and \$250 funeral expenses to Frank J. Siegfried, husband of Virginia Siegfried, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rep. No. 53). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 1984. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 338. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat; with amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 120. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 57. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1985. A bill providing for a service medal, ribbon, and clasp for honorable service in the armed forces of the United States during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1986. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to suppress and extirpate contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases of dogs and other carnivorous animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

of the States appointed the local boards. It just so happens there were 26 Republican governors. In the great Midwest throughout the farm States, including the State of Michigan, Republican governors named the draft boards, and they named the State officers of the local boards.

Shortly after the setting up of the Selective Service System I investigated the composition of the local draft boards in my own State. In the entire State of Michigan I found that there was just one Democratic local draft board member, and he did not last long. Every draft board official in that State, as far as I could discover, were Republicans. I can not imagine that the Republican governors of the other States in the Midwest farm belt acted very differently.

I am just wondering whether those local boards are not just hiding behind the unfortunate statement that was made by General Hershey when Order 288 was issued. I think we ought to look into that just a little bit further. When we are criticizing the administration we ought to also think about criticizing those who were charged with the administration of the Selective Service Act, and those who were charged with the administration of that act were the local boards appointed by the governors. The governors of the great Midwest farming States appointed the local boards. The local boards are responsible, and nobody ever expected the local boards to violate the law.

I think that covers the situation in pretty good shape.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know whether the gentleman was listening to what I said.

Mr. HOOK. Yes; I listened very attentively.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My point was that directive 288, which came down on January 3, gave the local boards the rule and the guide which they have since followed.

Mr. HOOK. It is my contention it gave the local boards that were appointed by Republican governors something to hide behind.

SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the other day when we were discussing the bill, H. R. 1752, I called the attention of the House to bulletins issued by the Treasury Department on the sale and offer for sale of surplus commodities the Government now is offering to the public. I have with me today two additional bulletins issued since that time. The material contained in these bulletins indicates to me that there is a tremendous quantity of materials being offered to the public that I think with a little investigation and ingenuity on the part of the

appropriate departments could be used very advantageously in the war effort rather than be sold at auction or on informal bid where in many instances they are sold for practically nothing.

To emphasize that point, let me call your attention to a recent offer. The story appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, yesterday. The Navy was offering to the public life rafts which are no longer needed, according to the Navy, some 1,900 of them, for 50 cents apiece. The Maritime Commission, realizing that they were worth more than 50 cents apiece, stepped in and said to the Navy, "We will take them over and sell them for \$50 apiece." They did, and the difference between 50 cents and \$50 was realized to the Treasury of the United States.

Another instance was cited in an editorial appearing in the Washington Post this morning. The editorial stated that—quote:

It is a shock to public confidence to hear that a dealer bought at auction for \$31 a Government-owned searchlight that was promptly resold to another Government agency for \$235.

Another witness confessed at a hearing that was being held by the Senate War Investigating Committee, and this is mentioned in the same editorial "that eight ship strainers from the Government were bought for \$3.25 apiece and sold to a ship repair firm working for the Government for \$12."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in full at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This editorial reads as follows:

SURPLUS SCANDALS

Under the chairmanship of Senator MEAD the Special War Investigating Committee is adding fresh laurels to those it won when Vice President TRUMAN was its head. The current probe into the affairs of an auctioneering firm known as Surplus Liquidators, Inc., highlights the need of improved safeguards to protect the public investment in billions of dollars of Government property that eventually will be classified as surplus materials. The recent setting up of a Surplus Property Board to formulate disposal policies and exercise supervision over agencies doing the actual work of disposal is only a first step. The agencies delegated to handle surpluses will have to be put on the alert to prevent the Government from being gypped by sharp and unscrupulous private dealers.

The unsavory details brought out by the inquiry into the affairs of Surplus Liquidators, Inc., certainly suggest a deplorable lack of competence and vigilance in administering the disposal program. It is a shock to public confidence to hear that a dealer bought at auction for \$31 a Government-owned searchlight that was promptly resold to another Government agency for \$235. Another witness confessed to buying eight ship strainers from the Government for \$3.25 each and selling them to a ship repair firm working for the Government for \$12.

These and other instances of petty though outrageous profiteering at Government expense as well as evidence indicating that Surplus Liquidators, Inc., had made good use of friends with political influence to secure auction contracts are not in themselves significant. Abuses of such kind in-

evitably occur whenever opportunity is afforded the greedy and unscrupulous to benefit at public expense. The moral pointed by the disclosure of irregularities is plain. It is that we need immediate reforms in the

Government's procurement and disposal practices. The Mead committee recently stressed the importance of improving procurement methods and further centralizing control of the procurement function. While recognizing that it is impossible to achieve a completely centralized system of procurement, the committee declares that "a great deal more could be done in centralizing control of procurement between the departments and between branches within the War Department and bureaus within the Navy Department, and more could be done toward centralizing procurement as between the War and Navy Departments."

However, elimination of the loose procurement practices will not prevent tremendous surpluses from developing as a result of conditions beyond anyone's control. In fact, the Mead committee points out that "huge amounts of a great variety of supplies have been accumulated which the armed services already know that they will not need." With the disposal problem already pressing and grave abuses currently being uncovered, Rudolph Halley, chief counsel for the Mead committee, properly emphasizes the need for strong and efficient investigating staffs in all Government disposal agencies to spot trouble and prevent scandals from developing. That is the only way to keep out the "bootleg element" that has already begun to prey upon the rich spoils that are piling up in Government warehouses as the war is prolonged.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize further the need of more careful investigation of the sale of the surplus commodities that I have been told amount to some \$15,000,000,000. I understand that under an act previously passed by the Congress none of this property can be sold that exceeds \$5,000,000 in value without action of this House. I think that amount ought to be decreased. We should have control over the sale of materials that cost less than \$5,000,000, because evidently, according to the editorial, appearing this morning's Post, considerable scandal has already been revealed in connection with the Surplus Liquidators, Inc., which shows that they are disposing of large quantities of these materials which in many instances are being sold back to Government departments when the Federal Government owned them before they were offered for auction.

I am going to offer an amendment to the Surplus commodities Act that has been passed by the Congress which will provide that the veterans of this war be given certificates of credit whereby they can obtain quantities of surplus commodities as a priority before the public has an opportunity to bid on them. I think the men who are now fighting are entitled to the opportunity to obtain some of the surplus commodities that may be beneficial to them in establishing a business or in rehabilitating themselves in whatever work they may want to perform when they return from the war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

House Calendar No. 31
H. RES. 120
[Report No. 56]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 5, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this
2 resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve
3 itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state
4 of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution
5 (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for
6 the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture. That
7 after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint
8 resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours to be
9 equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the
10 ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropria-
11 tions, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under
12 the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of

1 the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise
 2 and report the same back to the House with such amend-
 3 ments as shall have been adopted and the previous question
 4 shall be considered, as ordered on the joint resolution and
 5 amendments thereto to final passage without intervening
 6 motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 31

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 120

[Report No. 56]

RESOLUTION

For the consideration of H. J. Res. 85, a joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER

FEBRUARY 5, 1945

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 85

FEBRUARY 5, 1945.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

MR. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 120]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 120, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

○

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section

79th-1st, No. 22

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued February 7, 1945, for actions of Tuesday, February 6, 1945)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

A.A.A.....1,2,3,8	Forestry.....2	Price control.....2,10
Appropriations.....1,2,22	Grazing.....25	Property management.....6,24
Banking and currency.....4	Insect control.....2	Red Cross Month.....26
Census of agriculture.....1,22	Labor.....9,12,21	Research.....2
Centralization.....20	Lands.....25	Small business.....24
Commodity Credit.....2,7	Lend-lease.....5	Reconversion statistics.....2
Cost-of-living.....21	Loan agencies.....15,18	Transportation.....11,16
Crop insurance.....2	Manpower.....2,13,19	Veterans.....6
Executive authority.....14	Nomination.....15	Vocational rehabilitation.....23
Farm Credit.....17	Plant diseases.....2	
Foreign trade.....11	Post-war planning.....2,11	

HOUSE

1. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE. Began debate on H. J. Res. 85, appropriating \$6,784,000 additional for the census of agriculture for fiscal year 1945 (pp. 869-94). Reps. Michener, Mich., Brown, Ohio, Rich, Pa., and Taber, N. Y., criticized this measure, claiming that it would adversely affect the labor market during the manpower shortage (pp. 871-3). Reps. Jones, Ohio, and Johnson, Okla., discussed the possibility of the AAA "doing this job" (p. 874). Rep. Cannon, Mo., inserted Secretary Wickard's, Judge Jones', H. R. Tolley's, and others' letters to him favoring this project (pp. 879-83). Rep. Dirksen, Ill., opposed enactment of this resolution as unnecessary expenditure at this time and suggested that the Census Bureau would be able to get the pertinent information from this Department (pp. 883-5).
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President supplemental appropriation estimates as follows:
 - Department of Agriculture, \$29,750,000 for AAA (for (1) \$29,500,000 for payments at \$5 an acre, (2) \$200,000 for county association expenses, and (3) \$50,000 for AAA administrative expenses) (H. Doc. 64). (Amends 1946 Budget.)
 - Department of Agriculture, \$3,297,000 (BE&PQ, control of insect pests and plant diseases, \$1,088,000; FS, for fighting forest fires, \$1,959,114; and AAA, flax payment program, 1945 crop \$250,000) (H. Doc. 65);
 - Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, for basic economic statistics, \$13,098,000 (\$205,000 for BAE for consumer income data, \$492,000 for BAE and \$327,000 for BHN&HE for consumer expenditures and savings data) (H. Doc. 54);
 - Treasury Department, \$291,979,881.04 (including \$256,764,881.04 for restoration of CCC capital impairment and \$30,000,000 for subscriptions for FCIC capital stock) (H. Doc. 48);
 - OPA, \$6,790,000 (H. Doc. 49; and
 - WMC, \$5,567,400 (H. Doc. 63) (p. 898).
3. A.A.A. ALLOTMENTS. Rep. Flannagan, Va., requested immediate consideration of S. 338, to protect the allotments of farmers who have shifted to war crops of who have entered the armed services, but Rep. Rankin, Miss., objected, stating, "consideration should be postponed until we vote on the bill [H. J. Res. 85] now before the House" (p. 894).

4. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Crawford, Mich., criticized an American Banker article by Secretary Morgenthau, stating, "Since when has the Secretary of the Treasury received authority to determine what kind of legislation this Congress is going to enact on such matters as international currency stabilization and the international bank" (pp. 868-9).

SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Thurs., Feb. 8.

BILLS INTRODUCED

5. LEND-LEASE. H. R. 2013, by Rep. Bloom, N. Y., to extend the Lend-lease Act for 1 year. To Foreign Affairs Committee. (p. 898.)
6. VETERANS; SURPLUS PROPERTY. H. R. 2016, by Rep. McDonough, Calif., granting to veterans certain benefits and priorities in connection with the acquisition by them of surplus property. To Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee (p. 898-9.); and H. R. 2017, to amend the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944, granting to veterans certain benefits and priorities in connection with the acquisition by them of surplus property. To Military Affairs Committee. (p. 899.)
7. COMMODITY CREDIT. H. R. 2023, by Rep. Spence, Ky., to continue CCC as an agency of the U. S., increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, etc. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 899.)
8. A.A.A. TOBACCO. H. J. Res. 94, by Rep. Clements, Ky., relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the AA Act of 1938. To Agriculture Committee. (p. 899.)
9. FARM LABOR. H. Con Res. 27, by Rep. Lemke, N. Dak., to reaffirm the necessity of the Tydings amendment in our war effort, and creating a congressional committee to investigate the necessity of agricultural deferments. To Rules Committee. (p. 899.)
10. RENT CONTROL. H. R. 2022, by Rep. Crawford, Mich., to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize rents of D. C. commercial property. To District of Columbia Committee. (p. 899.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

11. TRANSPORTATION; FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Coffee, Wash., inserted his address with respect to the place of America's merchant marine in the post-war era (pp. A503-4).
12. FARM LABOR. Speech in the House by Rep. Woodruff, Mich., including communications, on directives and legal aspects on the drafting of farm labor (pp. A504-5).
Extension of remarks of Rep. Bunker, Nev., including a Nev. Legislature resolution, opposing the induction of farm labor (pp. A508-9).
13. NATIONAL SERVICE. Extension of remarks of Reps. Schwabe, Okla., Philbin, Mass., and Robison, Ky., criticizing H. R. 1752, "the work-or-fight bill" (pp. A505-6, A509-10, A513-6).

Association and of the study committee on post-war problems of the Bankers Association for foreign trade. It has been approved by the administrative committee of the American Bankers Association. The report is highly constructive and in the interests of the American people.

Upon what authority does the Secretary speak when he says—in speaking of the report—"that their advice will not be taken." After all, I had understood from the Secretary that he was going to let the Congress decide what would be in the text of the agreements as when and if approved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question nor has there been for a long time as to what we could do under the 1-minute ruling. I have had manuscripts sent back to me covering a 1-minute speech if it exceeded 300 words for printing in the Appendix. That has been the rule. But one Member of the majority has had his own speeches printed when they exceeded 500 words. Yet yesterday, under that 1-minute rule, we find printed 7 pages. I do not complain about either the insertion or the rule. I do not care how many pages Members put in, but I intend to insist if I can that we all have the same privilege and be governed in the same way. The only point I make is that the rule apply to all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TREATY WITH MEXICO

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of California traveled 3,000 miles back here to Washington to testify before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in opposition to the proposed treaty with Mexico which affects the future of California very vitally. He testified at length before that committee, at the conclusion of which time he was simply thanked by the committee for his statement. He was not asked one single question, nor was any comment made upon the testimony he gave.

Mr. Speaker, speaking, I feel confident, for the California delegation in the House I think I may say that we therefore assume that the committee must have agreed with everything Governor Warren said for otherwise certainly they would have accorded him the courtesy of asking

questions in order to draw out his viewpoint and to express any disagreement that they might have had with him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The question has been raised by two Members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] about certain matter that was inserted in the RECORD on yesterday, by another Member. The contention has been made that it was in violation of the rules of the House.

May I ask the Speaker if it would not be the proper procedure, if any Member feels that the rule has been violated, for him to make a point of order against the insertion, and if his point of order is sustained, then to move to strike the matter from the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. That could be done. Let the Chair explain the whole situation.

In the first place, the 1-minute rule was adopted in order that no Member could proceed for more than 1 minute prior to the business of the day on any day when there was a legislative program. The Chair has instructed the official reporters that if such a 1-minute speech and whatever extension is made of it amounts to more than 300 words, it must appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

As to the matter on yesterday, when a Member asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, whether or not he addresses the House in connection therewith and whether or not there is a legislative program for that day, if the extraneous matter covers more than two pages it is the duty of the Public Printer under regulation promulgated by the Joint Committee on Printing to return it, unless the Member, having first obtained an estimate of the cost from the Public Printer and included that estimate in his request, has obtained the unanimous consent of the House that the whole extension may be included in the RECORD. The Chair has tried to enforce the 300-word rule, and intends to, but he does not have any way of looking into what goes to the Printing Office in the extension of remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. A further parliamentary inquiry, if the Chair will bear with me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The point I wanted to bring out was that each Member has his remedy against any violation of the rules in that he may make a point of order against extraneous matter that has been inserted in violation of the rules, and if that point of order is sustained, then he may move to strike it from the RECORD. That would be much more in keeping with proper procedure than speaking about it on the floor and not doing anything in connection therewith.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. If the Chair will permit.

Mr. RICH. I am not trying to have this taken out of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I commend him for his alertness. But I am pointing out the proper procedure in such cases.

Mr. RICH. I am only interested that if we have rules in the House, those rules should be carried out. I was not trying to censor the Speaker of the House, but I know this, that if I did do so I would be carried clear from here down the Potomac to Chesapeake Bay so far that I would never get back.

The SPEAKER. There are 434 other Members of the House besides the occupant of the chair who have a duty to perform.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include about a 100-word article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 120, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered, as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Anderson, Calif.	Cannon, Fla.	Dawson
Baldwin, N. Y.	Chapman	De Lacy
Bolton	Chelf	Dingell
Bradley, Mich.	Clason	Doyle
Buckley	Cole, N. Y.	Durham

Eaton	Hollifield	Norton
Elliott	Holmes, Mass.	O'Brien, Mich.
Elsaesser	Izac	Outland
Engel, Mich.	Jenkins	Phillips
Fernandez	Johnson, Calif.	Powers
Gardner	Johnson,	Price, Fla.
Gavin	Lyndon B.	Price, Ill.
Gearhart	Kearney	Rees, Kans.
Geelan	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Gibson	King	Sasser
Granahan	Kirwan	Satterfield
Grant, Ind.	LaFollette	Shafer
Green	Lea	Sharp
Hand	Lemke	Sheridan
Harless, Ariz.	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Harness, Ind.	Lyle	Stockman
Hart	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	McGlinchey	Torrens
Havener	Madden	Towe
Healy	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Heldinger	Morgan	White
Hess	Morrison	Winter
Hinshaw	Mott	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the rule, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 120 makes in order House Joint Resolution 85 to appropriate \$6,784,000 for the continuation or completion of the agricultural census.

Very briefly the history of this act is that in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1944 the sum of \$650,000 was appropriated for the preliminary work or preliminary survey in anticipation of this census.

Thereafter, in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act of 1945, the sum of \$7,250,000 was appropriated which at that time was thought to be sufficient. Since that time, however, it has developed that the cost of taking this agricultural census is going to be materially more than could have been reasonably anticipated at the time the work was planned. This census is being taken, as it has been every 5 years since 1925, under a general act of this Congress providing that such census shall be taken every 5 years.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman not in error when he says this census is to be taken every 5 years? The act under which it is taken provides that it shall be taken every 10 years and that the first census shall be taken in the year 1935.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I meant to say 10 years.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I thought the gentleman would like to be corrected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is in error. The first census was taken in 1925.

Mr. KEEFE. I am speaking about the enabling legislation which the gentleman referred to in his speech.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but I was here during the Coolidge administration. This census was first provided for in 1919 and the first census under it was taken in 1925, and the law provided for it to be taken every 10 years thereafter.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I will say to the gentleman that every 10 years this agricultural census is taken in connection with the regular decennial census; in addition a further census is taken at the 5-year intervals occurring between the decennial census. Be that as it may, and the Committee on Appropriations can go into details when the bill comes up under the rule, the fact remains that the cost of taking this census is higher this year than it has ever been before, due to the fact that persons who ordinarily would be glad to accept employment of this sort, as enumerators, are making substantially more in defense industry and other places. It was estimated, based on previous experience, that it would cost 50 to 60 cents per tract, that is, per farm, to carry out this enumeration. It now develops that it will cost something like 90 cents per tract.

It is the position of the Committee on Appropriations that this information is necessary, particularly with the end of the war in sight, due to the fact that conditions are entirely different than they were in 1940, when the census was last taken, and this information as to the number of farms, the amount of equipment thereon, and the livestock available is necessary to plan intelligently for our agricultural future.

That, briefly, I think, covers the situation, which will be explained in more detail by the committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman tell us what the cost was in 1925?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not have that information. The Committee on Appropriations can supply the gentleman with this data.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The total request this year is for how much?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. This joint resolution is for \$6,784,000. Heretofore there has been appropriated the sum of \$7,250,000, plus \$650,000 which was originally agreed upon.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am curious to know whether this is not just a part of this national planning scheme. Is not this a part of what we might call the Gosplan, the same as Russia has?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I may say to the gentleman that other speakers from the Committee on Appropriations who will

follow me will be far better qualified to answer that question than am I.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The observation was made in the Committee on Rules that the Census Bureau is acting under a statute that is mandatory, and until that statute is repealed there is nothing the Congress can do but make the appropriation to enable the Bureau to do the job, which makes this joint resolution necessary. That is the justification for the measure.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. It is well to observe that a great demand for this appropriation is coming from the business and commercial world. Not only do the farmers need it but business all over the country wants it. It is not a New Deal proposition.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That is the information the committee received.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman will inform the House the number of man-hours that will be required to take the census.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not have that information, but I assume someone from the Committee on Appropriations will have it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In the event this joint resolution is passed, does the gentleman have any idea where we can get the people to take the census?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. The gentleman is equally well qualified to pass upon that question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual rule in that under the general rules of the House the Committee on Appropriations is privileged as far as general appropriations are concerned, but this is not a general appropriation bill, it is a specific appropriation measure providing an appropriation for \$6,784,000. Therefore, it must be considered under a rule. This rule grants 2 hours of general debate, and then the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) will be read under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does this appropriation carry out the work that is being administered by a man by the name of Capt?

Mr. MICHENER. I am not advised as to that. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALTER. Is this additional appropriation necessary because of the incompetency of Mr. Capt?

Mr. MICHENER. Members of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel sure, can give the gentleman such information as will satisfy him.

The law authorizing the taking of the agricultural census was passed in 1925, at a time when there was an abundance of manpower and when the country was at peace, with no prospect of war. Since that time we have passed through a depression and at the moment we are in the greatest war in all history. The economy of the country when this law was enacted is in no way comparable with present-day conditions. Then there was no Agricultural Adjustment Agency. There were no regional, State, county, and township committees, investigators, administrators, and what-have-you going among the farmers measuring their fields, keeping accounts as to their production, and supervising their activities. In those days, about the only direct contact the farmer had with the Federal Government was his local postmaster and his rural letter carrier. It undoubtedly was advisable at that time to make a general survey of farm acreage and farm possibilities in order to guide future agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with complete farm regulation and regimentation, with rationing and priorities, it would seem that all of these many agencies, boards, and bureaus have adequate information as to just what the farmer has accomplished during the last year.

When this law was enacted in 1925, the farmer was not required to keep books. Few of them were required to pay a Federal income tax and they were not required to submit to the visitations of the myriad inquisitors who now beset their path at every turn. And mark you, this is all because of laws enacted by the Congress and Executive orders issued by the President, the bureaus, and the other agencies. I sometimes wonder that the farmer is as patient as he is, with the handicaps under which he operates today. Historically an independent businessman, running his own project, sowing when he thought wise, reaping when he thought advisable, and marketing when and where his good judgment dictated, he was truly the master of his own financial destiny. This is all changed now.

The manpower shortage in this country is so desperate that within the last few days the House passed a work-or-fight bill. We are now drafting men for military service, and shortly we will be drafting them for service on the home front. Choice of occupation no longer exists when any manpower draft law is in effect. It is going to use manpower to take this agricultural census. It is going to take gasoline. It is going to take tires. It is going to take automobiles. Do not forget that visiting the farmer is only the beginning. Then the various blanks and forms and reports must channel up through county administrators, State administrators, regional administrators,

and Washington bureaus. These reports will finally be placed in the archives in the Census Bureau. Oh, Mr. Speaker, in these circumstances this is not the time or the place to appropriate \$6,784,000 of the people's money on such a useless and unnecessary project.

I am not condemning the taking of the census in ordinary times, when the data collected is valuable and oftentimes necessary. When this war is over, when peacetime economy approaches, and when there will be more people than there are jobs, the taking of an agricultural census may be helpful. It is inconceivable to me that there is any justification for such action now.

I am wondering how many of you have seen the questionnaire which the census enumerator is to use in his contact with the individual farmer. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has one of the forms here for your inspection. There we see page after page, questions running into the hundreds, important questions, unimportant questions, going all the way from the hired man's domestic connections to the spiritual approach of the farmer being interviewed. Oh, yes; the facts must be fully explained concerning each member of the family. We have heard much complaint about complicated income-tax returns. Well, this proposed questionnaire is a kindergarten primer compared with the most complex and baffling income-tax return ever conceived in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. These enumerators will surely require much instruction and study and must be people of unusual ability along this line before they can hope to assemble intelligent reports from the information furnished by the respective farmers. For my part, I believe the farmer has troubles enough right now. I believe he is compelled to make too many reports already. I shall accordingly vote against spending more than \$6,000,000 of his money as in this bill provided.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. If the gentleman from Ohio appears a little unusual this morning, it may be because of the fact that within the last few hours he has become a grandfather for the first time, and, believe it or not, it is twins, and boys at that.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that since November I have given careful study as to how we might be able to oust the New Deal. I have come to the determination we need more Republicans in the United States, and the Brown family is doing its part toward that desirable end.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 120 makes in order an appropriation of some six and one half million dollars in additional funds to conduct the 1945 census of agriculture. I gravely question the necessity of this work in time of war. This body has twice passed upon this particular issue, once when it was before the House on a direct vote, and the second time when the matter came back

from the Senate as an amendment and the House again rejected the appropriation. The statement has been made here that the law is mandatory. There is some question as to whether any mandatory statute can be enacted which will require the Congress to make such an appropriation. There is some question as to whether the Congress is under a mandatory requirement to make an appropriation for any particular purpose except as the Constitution of the United States may require. This census of agriculture will be made at a time, if the bill becomes law, when we are discussing seriously, and when this House has voted, I might say over my protest, to conscript men between the ages of 18 and 45 for war work. If we can judge by the past, the reports made as the result of this survey will not be available or usable until 2 or 3, or even 4 or 5 years from now. There is always a great delay between the taking of this census and the publication of the figures therefrom, which if they might be of any particular benefit certainly would not be of great worth after the war is over, because conditions surrounding agricultural production will change entirely the moment victory comes in Europe or in the Pacific. Therefore I will not support this rule because the House has twice passed upon this question. However, if the rule is adopted I want to urge every Member of this body to listen carefully to the debate as the members of the Committee on Appropriations, who are fully familiar with all of the details of this legislation, develop it. I urge every Member to follow the discussion closely and then vote his own judgment and his own conscience, because I believe that this appropriation cannot be justified at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker; with the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICH. While we are at war, should we send men out to take a census when the farmers need those men on the farm to raise crops? What are they going to say about such a procedure as this?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think this is entirely unnecessary, and will interfere with the production of food and with the efforts of the men on the farm who are already overworked.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I was going to ask the same question, as to whether this would not involve the use of considerable manpower at a time when we are told there is a great shortage of manpower?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I know the department has come into agricultural counties, as in my own section of southern Ohio, as the gentleman is aware, and set up large staffs which could be better occupied if they would go to work on the farms instead of farming the farmers. I hope the House will give this matter its very careful attention and in the end substantiate the action which the House has taken twice before, by rejecting this legislation.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE
APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I intended to make these short remarks under the 1-minute rule; but inasmuch as there are more than 300 words and the question has been raised, I ask at this time to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to call to the attention of the House a very significant thing that is now in progress and is worthy of our attention and commendation. Last week my office was called on the telephone, and I was invited to attend a dinner downtown by the A. A. A. in the interest of the rehabilitation of soldiers. Of course, the A. A. A. to me meant the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. However, when I arrived at the hotel I was astonished to learn that this A. A. A. was the American Automobile Association.

As you well know, the American Automobile Association has for years, in cooperation with the National Safety Council, been giving of its time and money primarily in sponsoring safety projects and safety driving on the highways of America. The very significant and commendable thing is the fact that this businessmen's organization is spearheading a program in cooperation with the Army and Navy in the rehabilitation of our maimed and wounded men to make it possible for them to become automobile drivers and safe drivers on our highways.

This association proposed to the Surgeon General that men convalescing in the various veterans' hospitals be sent to Washington to be trained in the art of driving automobiles and then return to their various stations to teach others. The automobile association would furnish the necessary instructors, the course of study, and the equipment, and the Army was to furnish housing facilities at Walter Reed Hospital during the instruction course.

The course has now been completed for the first group. The dinner to which I referred was the graduating exercises at which certificates of graduation were issued to bear witness that the holder of said certificate was a competent and safe driver and recommended for a driver's license. Up to this point there is not anything so very unusual until we take a look at the men. There were some 25 men in this graduating class. Some had lost 1 leg, some both legs were gone. One has an arm missing and others with serious disabilities. These were the men who were to be sent back to their various stations to teach other men, such as they, to become safe automobile drivers.

I especially want to call to your attention four of these men, none of whom are from my district or State, but are returning to a large hospital located in my district to become instructors. We have Lieutenant Romiti, from Oregon, who had the misfortune of losing a leg.

Sergeant Saunders, from California, who lost his arm and also had a badly mangled leg. Sergeant Molyneux, from Idaho, and Joe Miller, a civilian from Montana. I must tell you something about Joe. He had the misfortune of losing both legs early in his youth. After Pearl Harbor he wrote the President of the United States and told him he wanted to go to war. Yes, he could have been classified in IV-F. By the direction of the President he was assigned to duty as an instructor in mechanics at which he is an expert, and he is now an automobile driver instructor.

When I mingled with these men, listened to their conversation and gay spirits I was unaware of their condition until told. The last thing on earth these men want is sympathy, the last thing they want is an automobile built for their special benefit. All they want and need is a good old standard-shift stock automobile with some gas in it and they are ready to drive in all kinds of traffic and on all the highways.

This demonstration was a real inspiration to me to see what the medical profession has accomplished in this war not only in the field of medicine but in surgery and plastic surgery. It even outstrips our great production program about which we boast, and when I see what has been done I stand in awe and reverence to this branch of the armed services. When one contemplates the great sacrifice that these young men have already made and the long, determined hours they have spent to be rehabilitated and in rehabilitating themselves, it makes one want to hide his face in shame at the trifling things about which we sometimes complain. These men have given part of their bodies in their fight for freedom, but in spite of this they have retained their indomitable will to be normal, useful citizens. Not only that, they are willing to lend their efforts and radiate this magnificent spirit to others like themselves, that they, too, will persevere and become useful citizens. They have emerged from a world wrought with sorrow, blood, and tears to bring to light once more the dignity and greatness of men and the glory of God—yes; moving us one step closer to the realization of the answer to a question that was asked long, long ago, and has been ringing in our ears down through the centuries, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is a scheme designed to sabotage the work-or-fight bill passed last week; in other words, it is being brought in here for a declaration by the House of Representatives that we can put people to work at something that is not necessary and desirable at this time and at the same time say to the country that we are going to lock them up if they do not work. I said it was not necessary; I will go into that in a minute.

There is no requirement of law that this be done. There is authority for it, but that authority becomes a requirement only when the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives

and the Senate pass a bill providing funds so that the job can be done. We all ought to understand that and know what the picture is. Not an item of information will be gathered that is not already in the possession of our county agents and our A. A. A. committeemen. In other words, this is another demonstration of the desire to duplicate and create confounding activities in the Government.

Last January 14—and I have it in front of me—there was a release by the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, giving a résumé of practically the information that is proposed to be gathered here. It is perfectly ridiculous for us at this time to do such a thing as to provide a total of almost \$15,000,000 for this operation. Six hundred and fifty thousand dollars was provided in the first appropriation. That was followed by \$7,250,000 and now they want a little better than \$6,800,000—a total of nearly \$15,000,000. On the basis of last report only \$254,000 had been spent. They have been having all sorts of difficulty in getting help.

At the time we held our hearings letters were presented by a lot of people who wanted more money for this operation. In one of these letters the statement, among others, was made that they could make a lot more money picking cotton without spending money for gasoline or using their precious tires. Why should we be spending our precious tires and our gasoline that is rationed for cutting such capers and sabotaging the work-or-fight bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Whoever wrote that letter evidently never saw a cotton stalk. You do not pick cotton in February, March, or April.

Mr. TABER. It was the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] who cited this letter in the hearings and it appears on page 18 thereof. I read this right from the hearings and it is a statement from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. If the gentleman means to direct his indictment at the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], why, that would be a quarrel he would have with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] and not with me. I cannot make any such statement about the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Since the gentleman has mentioned my name, why does he not read into the RECORD what was said?

Mr. TABER. Yes. I will read the exact quotation:

Many tell me that they can make a lot more picking cotton and without spending money for gasoline or using the precious tires.

That is the exact quotation, and I have read it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is part of it.

Mr. TABER. It is the quotation to which I was referring. If the gentleman wants to read any more of it he will be able to get plenty of time to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that this is a direct competitive proposition from a labor standpoint with the war effort and is direct competition with the labor that is required for war activities, because it is proposed to carry on with that labor.

Mr. Speaker, I have been over this situation with a great many people. I have heard from my farmers and farm organizations. They have called me on the telephone because they were disturbed that such a thing as this could be indulged in at this time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] makes the point of order a quorum is not present. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Anderson, Calif.	Gavin	Lea
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gearhart	Luce
Barden	Geelan	Lyle
Barrett, Pa.	Gibson	McGlinchey
Bates, Ky.	Gifford	Madden
Bates, Mass.	Granahan	May
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Calif.
Biemiller	Green	Morgan
Bradley, Mich.	Gregory	Morrison
Bradley, Pa.	Hand	Mott
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.
Butler	Harness, Ind.	Outland
Byrne, N. Y.	Hart	Patterson
Canfield	Hartley	Pfeifer
Carlson	Havenner	Phillips
Chelf	Healy	Plumley
Clements	Hébert	Powers
Cole, Kans.	Heldinger	Rees, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Sasscer
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Satterfield
De Lacy	Hope	Scrivner
Delaney,	Izac	Shafer
John J.	Jenkins	Sheridan
Dickstein	Jensen	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Johnson, Calif.	Stockman
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson,	Thomas, N. J.
Doyle	Lyndon B.	Torrens
Eaton	Kearney	Towe
Elliott	Kee	Vursell
Elsaesser	Kefauver	Welch
Engle, Calif.	Kilday	White
Fernandez	King	Winter
Gardner	Kirwan	Wolcott
	LaFollette	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and twenty-eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. BONNER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may proceed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when the roll call interrupted, this is a direct attempt to sabotage the

labor market and to sabotage the work-or-flight bill we passed last week. It is absolutely unnecessary. The information that is desirable is already available. It is not mandatory unless the Congress decides to make the appropriation for it. The estimate presently before the Congress involves practically \$15,000,000. It is an increase of almost 75 percent over the cost of the last previous farm census. It will be of almost no value because of the very erratic conditions upon farms, very unusual conditions, conditions where certain types of livestock have been built up to a tremendous figure and other types cut down; conditions where the production of farms has shifted in such way that it is absolutely impossible to base any operation or calculation upon the results of this census.

What we should do here is to stop this operation and stop it now. On the basis of last accounts only about \$254,000 have actually been paid out. I presume more has been paid out since the first of January. On the other hand, there has not been anything like the \$7,900,000 that has heretofore been appropriated spent and we could stop this thing before any more of that money is wasted and before we provide another practically \$7,000,000 to waste.

This census proposition has been upon an entirely false basis. We have built up duplicating activities in the agricultural committeemen and in the county agricultural agents where they have practically all the information current in my country, and if the Census Department and the Department of Agriculture would coordinate the information that is already available there would be absolutely no necessity whatever for such a thing as this census.

I called attention a little while ago to a release from the Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau which indicate that they have practically everything they are asking for now available at the present time. This release was issued right in the middle of preparation for hearings upon this bill.

I am hoping that after the House has debated this bill it will refuse to waste \$6,800,000 for this purpose and will refuse to join in an effort to sabotage the work-or-flight bill. It is about time that we begin to wake up and realize that we are in the war instead of fooling around and wasting money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my district, the Eighth Michigan, the farmers are in virtual revolt over losing their sons to the military forces, thereby cutting the production of foodstuffs. I cannot imagine anything that would more incite them at the present time than to start having solicitors going through the communities with all this talk about shortage of manpower, with the loss of their boys to the military forces, the cutting of the production of food, and call of Mr. Jones, War Food Administrator, for additional food, and these solicitors getting up informa-

tion that is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. TABER. And absolutely preventing people from being employed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE].

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, in taking a census we are taking stock of our national assets. The gentleman who just preceded me seemed to think that is not necessary. I wonder if the gentleman deems it unnecessary for his bank to make a periodical audit and report to its stockholders and its depositors in order that they may know how it is being run. I wonder if that same gentleman would say that the big business institutions of this country should operate without taking stock of themselves and finding out where they are. The same thing may be said of merchants and certainly it is true of the farmers. The farmers should take stock and we should take stock of our national farm situation in order that we may know what stock piles we have, where our shortages exist, if they do exist, and where we have a surplus.

Mr. Speaker, this same gentleman and others on his side are the very ones who have criticized the fact that there was a shortage in our stock piles of rubber and tin and many other critical materials needed for this war. They are the ones who said that if we had had the information we would not have been caught in this particular short position. It is good business, Mr. Speaker. Any sensible man recognizes the necessity of taking stock at regular intervals. How else is he going to know where he stands and what he needs?

I have heard many of my learned colleagues get up and say that we had an oversupply of this and an oversupply of that. They said that we had a certain number of cattle on the range. They said that we had a certain amount of dairy products. I want to know where they got their information. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if that information is correct. They quoted figures as facts. Where did they get them? I want to know just exactly how many farms we have in my own district. I would like to know how many thousands of acres have gone out of production and the various reasons why they have gone out of production. It may have been due to shortage of manpower. It may have been due to shortage of equipment. It may have been due to any one of a thousand different things.

I want to know why there is a shortage of bacon. I want to know why there is a shortage of butter. Have any of you been able to buy those things for your table recently? I want to know what has become of the beef. I want to know, if it is on the farm, why it has not reached the processor. I want to know why it is not on the shelves of the merchants. Is it a black-market proposition? I think it is time that we should find out exactly where we are and what we have. Common sense, Mr. Speaker, dictates that we

should have this census, and that it should be made available to the people of this Nation just as soon as possible. Common sense, Mr. Speaker, demands that we find out what we have. How are we going to meet our commitments, if these commitments are now being made by the Big Three to feed the world, if we do not know what we have to feed the world on? How are we going to make our plans for the post-war period? How are we going to know how many men we can reemploy on the farms if we do not know what the farms need?

Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous for anybody to get up here and talk about the spending of a mere \$15,000,000 for the purpose of getting this vital information when we are spending billions of dollars blindly and not looking back.

I urge the Members to give very serious consideration to the necessity of this information. If the bank needs its audit, if the railroads and big industries need their financial reports, if the storekeeper needs to take stock of his merchandise, if the Army needs to inventory its equipment, stock piles, and manpower, then the Nation needs this agricultural census to determine its food resources and potentialities.

I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this resolution which the rule would make in order for the House to consider has some background which I would like to discuss first.

In 1929, when the basic law was established that authorized the taking of this census I will say it was a good law. The farmers of the country ought to have a census of all of their products so that they know where they stand. But since the law was passed in 1929 a new administration came upon the scene and it established the A. A. A.; since the war it established the War Food Administration; to find out about the manpower on the farms they created State and county boards in each and every State and county, respectively, for the 48 States and the three-thousand-odd counties of the United States. What is the work of the A. A. A.? The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in the first place, was supposed to be an agency that would cut down production. A. A. A. committeemen were the local agents of the ever-normal granary. The war emptied the granary and took away their jobs. Farm surpluses were eliminated. The Army, Lend-Lease and other war commitments of the Government left A. A. A. committeemen without a reason for existence. However, bureaucracy rose to the occasion with a new enterprise for the local patronage. Someone conceived the idea that these A. A. A. committeemen could be the local messengers and agents of the Agriculture Department to increase production on the farms for war purposes.

How can the A. A. A. committeemen increase the production on the farms un-

less they know every year just how much livestock, how much food and fiber is to be raised on the farms? That precisely has been the job of the A. A. A. committeemen since the war began.

How many A. A. A. committeemen are there? In my county, in a typical mid-western district, there are 77 A. A. A. committeemen in each county. There are three county committeemen and three alternates on the pay roll annually, by the year in each county. There are three township committeemen and three alternates in each township of my district. What is their job? Their job is to make a survey on forms furnished by the Department of Agriculture to give to the War Food Administration, to the O. P. A., and to the Department of Agriculture the very things this census proposes to do. The basic law for this appropriation contemplated the necessity of a census every 10 years. Why in the name of conscience should we have an agricultural census this year prepared by the Census Bureau in view of the conditions I have described, unless this Congress means to tell the people, on the eve of passing a work-or-fight bill carrying the penalty of a prison sentence or a fine, that it envisions the day when there will be three men asking questions to one man farming?

The consideration of this question today is above politics. It is a question of conserving the manpower of which the Army and the Navy says we are deficient.

What was the condition in the calendar year of 1944, when the regular Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, appropriation bill came before the House? The subcommittee on Department of Commerce appropriations recognized the shortage of manpower then, and we cut this agriculture census provision out of that supply bill. Why? I repeat, because the A. A. A. committeemen, the War Food Administration, and the O. P. A. have the information by the quarter every year.

Did you notice, when Chester Davis resigned in the middle of the year 1944 from the War Food Administration, what he told the President? "I think I will resign now," he said in effect, "because the food and fiber program for 1945 should be put into effect promptly." The war food program for 1945 was envisioned and consummated and was on the books for the war effort long before the beginning of 1945, and you who are interested in and know about the mechanics of the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration know that to be true. The letter of Chester Davis confirms it.

The subcommittee on Commerce Department appropriations eliminated that item from the bill. The Senate put it in to the tune of \$7,500,000. When it came back in a conference report I attempted to cut out the duplication. The cost of the A. A. A. committeemen to collect this information quarterly is about \$26,000,000 a year, so I said, "If we are going to have a census of agriculture in 1945, when we have all of these other duplicating war agencies, then let us write an amendment, a prohibition, on this bill, and let the Department of Commerce take the census and prohibit all other

agencies from spending any money for the same purpose.

What happened to it? The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amendment went beyond the authority of the subcommittee considering appropriations for the Department of Commerce. Today we are past that stage of eliminating the A. A. A., the W. F. A., and other war agencies from spending money on a farm census.

The A. A. A. committeemen are spending \$26,000,000 annually to collect that information. The next best thing we can do now to conserve and save manpower is to cut out this appropriation for this farm census here and now, because the A. A. A. committeemen do it every year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the burden of the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, as well as others who have spoken in opposition to this legislation, is that it is not needed because it is charged that the A. A. A. can do that job. If that were actually true, despite the fact that Congress has heretofore appropriated over seven and a quarter million dollars to take this census as required by law, much of which has been obligated, then their point might be well taken, even though such alleged argument comes pitifully late. That might have been valid argument in 1943, when Congress appropriated \$650,000 to start this agricultural census. But now, the charge that the A. A. A. can do the job, I say, comes mighty late. But is it true? What are the facts? The record discloses that the Department of Agriculture says it needs it. That is also what the Secretary of Agriculture says. That is what Hon. Marvin Jones, the Food Administrator, tells us. Is it reasonable that both would insist that this census be taken if they had that information or had the facilities for securing this particular information? Does that sound plausible? If Judge Marvin Jones had that information, those of you who have served with him in the House of Representatives and know that he is an able, conscientious, and fearless public servant, must know that he would not under any circumstances urge the passage of the pending bill. Again, the opposition in their desperation have repeatedly stated the law requires that the census be taken only every 10 years. To which law do they refer? Surely they know that there are at least two laws on the statute books governing the taking of the census. One is section 201, and the other is section 216 of the code, enacted the same year of 1929, which incidentally was under a Republican administration, a year that some of our Republican brethren would like to forget. One of those census laws handed us in 1929 called for a complete census of business, agriculture, and commerce, beginning in 1930. The other law,

both of which were mandatory, provided for an agricultural census alone, the same to begin in 1935.

So, just to keep the record straight, let us not say the law, when, in fact, there are two laws on the statute books with reference to the taking of the census. They are plain and mandatory.

Now, if we have cleared that up and rubbed the cobwebs out of our thinking about the law, I want to answer, if I may, some of the rather unusual statements of our esteemed friend from New York, who is violently opposing the pending bill. Let me say that I was surprised and shocked at the opening statement of the gentleman from New York to the effect that the real purpose of this legislation is to sabotage the work-or-fight bill. Frankly, I am amazed and somewhat chagrined that the gentleman from New York would make such an absurd and groundless statement. Heretofore I have heard the gentleman make many wild and radical statements during our services together in the House. We all realize that he often makes strong statements in an effort to carry his point, but to question the patriotism of those backing this bill will not enlarge his stature or enhance his standing on either side of this aisle. I know the gentleman does not mean to leave that unfortunate statement in the RECORD. I know the gentleman does not in his heart mean to tell this House that the real purpose of those who have sponsored this legislation is to sabotage the work-or-fight program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is the result.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield at this time unless the gentleman desires to back up on his unfortunate statement or explain what he really means.

Mr. TABER. That is the result.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then the gentleman desires to stand by that statement?

Mr. TABER. Why, certainly. It is the result and it is the fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not care to yield further to the gentleman, who, when he cools off, will no doubt correct that statement. The gentleman surely is too fine and big to stand on a statement impugning the motives and questioning the patriotism of those who happen to disagree with him. Of course, I might add that it comes with poor grace for the gentleman to be appealing here to men on his side of this Chamber to stand by the work-or-fight bill. Maybe the gentleman has forgotten that practically all the opposition to that measure came from gentlemen on the Republican side of this Chamber.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield—

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; I do not yield, unless the gentleman has repented and desires to apologize for his rash statement a few moments ago.

Mr. TABER. I voted for that bill and I spoke on it. The gentleman can find out just where I stood on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will take the gentleman's word for it with-

out looking up the record. I do not question his motives in opposing this bill, although I have a sneaking suspicion that petty partisan politics is the main propelling factor.

Mr. Speaker, again I was surprised and disappointed that the same gentleman read one sentence into the RECORD from a letter I placed in the RECORD, written by a census supervisor in Oklahoma. It is obvious from the one or two sentences read that he would leave the impression that I am opposed to this legislation or that the author of the letter in question was opposed to finishing the job they have begun. The opposite, of course, is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The letter made the point clear that he could not secure capable enumerators at the low cost of 51 cents per family being paid by the Census Bureau in Oklahoma; that additional funds must be forthcoming if the job is to be completed. That letter was strong and convincing evidence favoring the passage of this bill to finish the job. Frankly, I am surprised that the gentleman should pick out one or two isolated sentences.

Now, I do not care to answer the argument that this bill will sabotage the war effort or it will have that result, further than to say that the gentleman making that charge knows that all enumerators and others in connection with this program must be cleared through the United States Employment Service. Most of the enumerators thus far appointed are farm women. May I add that when the Congress appropriated \$650,000 to start this work back in 1943, there was no serious opposition from the gentleman from New York. His opposition was very mild last fall when over \$7,000,000 was appropriated for the same purpose.

Many of the gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber were willing to carry out the mandate of the law early last fall after the provision was written into the law that enumerators could not be appointed until after the election. That provision seemed fair enough and was not objected to by Democratic Members of Congress. We know, of course, of the great disappointment of the gentleman from New York and many of his colleagues. Let us be honest about this whole matter. Is there anyone here who thinks that a single Member on the Republican side of this aisle would have raised his voice against it had their side won? It is not our fault that they guessed wrong. But, honest in-jun, is it good sportsmanship to come here at this late hour and rant and rave and question the motives of those of us who are still supporting this legislation and want to see the job finished? That is all there is to it now. This Government has a moral obligation that it cannot repudiate or ignore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time, and I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there was a fight made against the original appropriation of \$650,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mighty weak.

Mr. TABER. Mighty weak, but enough to carry the opposition through to success in the House. It was only put in after it went to the Senate, and then the conference was opposed. Then there was an item in the Census bill for this matter and it went out in the House. The conference, after it was put back in the Senate, was opposed. There was nothing in the nature of politics raised except by the proponents of the bill. We do not have to resort to politics on this. The facts of the situation are that there is no justification for the expenditure and that is the reason why I am opposed to it, as I have been to countless other useless and vicious measures that were brought in here.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think if the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] had kept a little closer in touch with this crop report in 1943 he would not have allowed the State of Virginia to get over a million dollars worth of free hay, when his State really had a drought and did not get any of the free hay.

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What will it cost to take this census?

Mr. TABER. The total cost will be practically \$15,000,000 as against \$9,000,000 the last time it was taken, because it is handled in such a way and at such a time, in competition with the war effort.

Mr. RICH. Do you think anyone on the Democratic side can tell us where we will get the \$15,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I would not ask them that question. They print it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have a question that does not particularly have to do with this controversy. If this agricultural census is taken and all of this information becomes available to the Department of the Census, will it be possible for the Congress, its individual members or the Committees of Congress, to get the information that may be wanted from time to time, from the Department of the Census, or is it necessary that the information be cleared through the various departments or bureaus of the Government who themselves seek to transmit information from the Census Department to us?

Mr. TABER. I could not answer that question, but I imagine that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I notice on the form there is a heading which reads that this information will be confidential during the war.

Mr. TABER. Confidential only as to individuals; not as to gross results.

Mr. HALLECK. My inquiry is this: I cannot see any reason why the Congress or its committees should not have access to the information the Department of the Census could give us from this census or any other census rather than the Congress being required, as I understand the Congress is required, to go through other departments of the Government to the Bureau of the Census.

The TABER. That should be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat amusing to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] advance the rather novel theory that had he been permitted to attach a limitation to the appropriation for the farm census carried in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill which was out of order because it would have applied only to the agriculture appropriation bill, this issue would not have arisen; in other words, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], in violation of the rules of the House had been permitted to handicap the statistics gathering activities of the Department of Agriculture by attaching to a bill totally foreign to the Department of Agriculture which carried no funds therefor a restriction which was not permissible under the rules of the House, applying only to the Department of Agriculture funds, this issue according to him, would not have arisen.

Now, let me talk to you Democrats, because we are going to get few if any Republican votes, let me talk to you Democrats about what the issue here is. These gentlemen on the Republican side who artfully say they want you to examine the issues here in the light of the facts and arrive at a judgment dictated by conscience, are camouflaging. On the Appropriations Committee not a single one of them supported this appropriation, and in my judgment there will not be a single one of them who will vote for this bill on passage. They are simply trying to mislead a few of the Democrats in the hope that if your votes were added to theirs they would be sufficient to defeat the passage of the measure.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

They say it is not necessary to secure this information; yet last year they were perfectly willing to have the farm census and to appropriate in excess of \$7,000,000—almost \$8,000,000—for the purpose of beginning the job provided there might be attached to the appropriation the condition that the enumerators should not be appointed until after the 1st of January when they confidently

anticipated they would be appointed under Republican administration and not under Democratic administration. After it was ascertained by the election held on November 7 that their hopes in that connection were not justified, their opposition to further appropriations became intense, and on account of the absence of a few of our Democratic Members from Washington they were able to defeat the making of the necessary deficiency appropriation during the latter part of the last Congress and to that extent to handicap the work so that it now hangs suspended in midair with about half of it done and the rest of it contracted for, and with the determination here on their part to stop it. If that is done all that has been spent will in reality be a total waste and accomplish nothing of benefit to the farmers. That is purely a question of political patronage. That is one reason for the opposition, but there is another: Mr. Speaker, this farm census will demonstrate the fact that the farm program of this administration has resulted in placing American agriculture in the best status it has occupied in 40 years.

The statistics which will be collected when this program is carried through will demonstrate that not all of the wailings with regard to the condition of agriculture in the country are justified but that the farm program as at present and for several years carried on has been of greater benefit to the American farmer than anything else which has been undertaken in his behalf, as I have said, in the last 40 years. Under these circumstances, I do not see why any man on this—the Democratic—side of the aisle should lend his support to the unanimous efforts of the ladies and gentlemen on the other side to hamstring this thing which has already been undertaken.

They say it should not have been undertaken. Perhaps that is true. I think it should have been undertaken. The War Food Administration needs this statistical information to be developed by this census. At least it say it does. The fact it has some estimates as to the agricultural resources of the country is not indicative of its having sufficient information on that subject. We saw in the papers a day or so ago an estimate by the Bureau of the Census as to the population of the United States, an estimate of 138,000,000-plus. That does not mean that the Bureau of the Census has taken a new population census. It means that from the best sources of information available it now makes that estimate of the population of the United States. Will anybody say that on that account there should not be a population census taken in 1950 to determine adequately and definitely just what the population of the country is, or shall be continue to rely upon the general estimates of the Bureau of the Census?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the distinguished advocate of economy from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In reference to the census the gentleman is talking about, if 1950

were today during a war period, the gentleman would not want to go out and take a census now when it is necessary for the manpower of this Nation to do the things that are going to be essential in order to win the war. The gentleman should not.

Mr. TARVER. At least I would not go halfway through the census, provide for taking a census as did the Seventy-eighth Congress, make more than half the money available, and then after getting it halfway through, if disappointed by the result of a national election, which I had hoped would give my party patronage control, undertake to stop it on that account. That is exactly what is happening here today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 198, nays 160, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—198

Abernethy	Flannagan	Murdock
Allen, Ill.	Flood	Murphy
Allen, La.	Folger	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Forand	Neely
Andrews, Ala.	Gallagher	Norrell
Angell	Gathings	Norton
Arnold	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Bailey	Gorski	O'Brien, Mich.
Baldwin, Md.	Gossett	O'Toole
Barry	Granger	Outland
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Beckworth	Hare	Patman
Bell	Harless, Ariz.	Patrick
Bland	Harris	Patterson
Bloom	Hays	Peterson, Fla.
Bonner	Healy	Peterson, Ga.
Boykin	Hedrick	Philbin
Brooks	Heffernan	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	Poage
Bryson	Hobbs	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hoch	Price, Fla.
Bunker	Holifield	Price, Ill.
Burch	Hook	Priest
Burgin	Huber	Quinn, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson	Rabaut
Camp	Jarman	Rabin
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson	Rains
Cannon, Mo.	Luther A. Johnson, Okla.	Ramspeck
Carnahan	Kefauver	Randolph
Chapman	Kelley, Pa.	Rankin
Clark	Keogh	Rayfiel
Clements	Kerr	Resa
Coffee	King	Richards
Colmer	Kirwan	Riley
Cooley	Knutson	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Kopplemann	Robinson, Utah
Courtney	Lane	Roe, Md.
Cox	Lanham	Roe, N. Y.
Cravens	Larcade	Rogers, Fla.
D'Alesandro	Lea	Rogers, N. Y.
Daughton, Va.	Lesinski	Rooney
Davis	Link	Rowan
Dawson	Ludlow	Russell
Delaney	McCormack	Ryter
James J. Domengeaux	McGehee	Sabath
Doughton, N. C.	McKenzie	Sadowski
Douglas, Calif.	McMillan, S. C.	Savage
Douglas, Ill.	Mahon	Sheppard
Doyle	Maloney	Sikes
Drewry	Manasco	Simpson, Ill.
Durham	Mansfield, Mont.	Sllaughter
Earthman	Mansfield, Tex.	Smith, Va.
Eberharter	Marcantonio	Snyder
Engle, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Sparkman
Ervin	Mills	Spence
Fallon	Monroney	Starkey
Feighan	Morgan	Stewart
Fisher	Mundt	Stigler
		Sullivan
		Summers, Tex.

Tarver	Voorhis, Calif.	Winstead
Thom	Wasielewski	Wood
Thomas, Tex.	Weaver	Woodhouse
Thomason	Weiss	Woodrum, Va.
Tolan	West	Worley
Traynor	Whitten	Zimmerman
Trimble	Whittington	
Vinson	Wickersham	

NAYS—160

Adams	Gillette	Morrow
Andersen,	Gillie	Michener
H. Carl	Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.
Andrews, N. Y.	Graham	Murray, Wis.
Arends	Griffiths	O'Hara
Auchincloss	Gross	O'Konski
Barrett, Wyo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	O'Neal
Beall	Gwynne, Iowa	Phillips
Bender	Hagen	Pittenger
Bennet, N. Y.	Hale	Ploeser
Bennett, Mo.	Hall	Plumley
Bishop	Edwin Arthur	Ramey
Blackney	Hall	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hancock	Rich
Brumbaugh	Henry	Rizley
Buck	Herter	Robertson,
Buffett	Heseltun	N. Dak.
Butler	Hill	Robison, Ky.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hinshaw	Rockwell
Campbell	Hoeven	Rodgers, Pa.
Carlson	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Case, N. J.	Holmes, Wash.	Schwabe, Mo.
Case, S. Dak.	Hope	Schwabe, Okla.
Chenoweth	Horan	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Howell	Shafer
Church	Hull	Sharp
Clason	Jennings	Short
Clevenger	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Cochran	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Jones	Springer
Crawford	Jonkman	Stefan
Cunningham	Judd	Stevenson
Curtis	Kean	Sumner, Ill.
Dirksen	Keefe	Sundstrom
Dolliver	Kelly, Ill.	Taber
Dondero	Kilburn	Talbot
Dworshak	Kinzer	Talle
Ellis	Kunkel	Taylor
Ellsworth	Landis	Tibbott
Elsaesser	LeCompte	Vorys, Ohio
Elston	LeFevre	Vursell
Engel, Mich.	Lemke	Wadsworth
Fellows	Lewis	Walter
Fenton	McConnell	Weichel
Fuller	McCowen	Welch
Fulton	McDonough	Wigglesworth
Gamble	McGregor	Wolcott
Gearhart	McMillen, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton, N. J.
Gifford	Martin, Mass.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillespie	Mason	

NOT VOTING—72

Anderson, Calif.	Ellott	Kilday
Andresen,	Fernandez	LaFollette
August H.	Gardner	Luce
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavin	Lyle
Barden	Geelan	Lynch
Barrett, Pa.	Gibson	McGlinchey
Bates, Mass.	Granahan	Madden
Biemiller	Grant, Ind.	May
Boren	Green	Morrison
Bradley, Mich.	Gregory	Mott
Bradley, Pa.	Hand	Pfeifer
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Canfield	Hart	Rees, Kans.
Celler	Hartley	Rivers
Chelf	Havener	Sasser
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	Satterfield
Combs	Heldinger	Sheridan
Crosser	Hess	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Stockman
De Lacy	Izac	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney,	Jenkins	Torrens
John J.	Johnson,	Towe
Dickstein	Lyndon B.	White
Dingell	Kearney	Wilson
Eaton	Kee	Winter

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Hartley against.

General pairs:

Mr. Gardner with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hand.
Mr. De Lacy with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. John J. Delaney with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. May with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX changed his vote from nay to yea.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE
APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture, with Mr. MURPHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be notified when I have consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, let us talk sense about this resolution providing for an agricultural census.

Substantially all the facts this census seeks to obtain are already available from the different governmental departments which have had to obtain and assemble such information as a basis for their work toward winning the war. So why spend the taxpayers' money wastefully to make work for a group who might much better be employed on the farms where they are urgently needed rather than working at obtaining information already obtained heretofore and made available.

The information which the departments have obtained is available and accessible now and is being used. The

information which this proposed census would undertake to accumulate would not be of any value until it had been screened and codified which would take at least 6 months. That is the answer to the question as to when it would be available for use in connection with the war effort.

These are the facts. To my mind they are the answer to the question of the necessity for the immediate making of this census.

I am not opposed to the making of an agricultural census as such, but I am opposed to its having to be made now when its present uselessness is so apparent.

If we were not at war that would be a different matter. If the questions asked were within the law, which they are not, that would be another. But the fact remains that the fundamental and necessary information sought to be obtained by this census is now readily accessible and available, and is being used.

Moreover, as I have said, any information sought to be obtained under the present plan would not be available for some 6 months. It would be useless so far as its value to the present war effort is concerned. In short, the agricultural census would be a delayed duplication.

This census so to be taken involves an expenditure of an awful lot of money which must necessarily come out of the pocket of the taxpayers. It is one of those things which could be properly postponed. I am in favor of such postponement. I am against the resolution.

Such a census as is contemplated would be only a duplication of effort to no good purpose and to serve no worthwhile end presently. No farmer needs it as much as he does the dollar which would have to come out of his pocket to pay for a job for somebody who might better be working on his farm than serving as a census enumerator.

The time to stop wasteful, useless expenditures of the taxpayers' money is now. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the pending resolution provides money to complete the agricultural census of 1945.

The issue presented by the resolution is clear and unmistakable. It resolves itself into two very simple questions: first, shall we obey the mandate of the law? Second, shall we finish the job?

Some question was raised in the debate on the rule as to whether the statute is mandatory. In response to that may I quote from section 16 of 13 United States Code, 216:

There shall be made in the year 1935, and once every 10 years thereafter, a census of agriculture and livestock.

Not "there may be," but "there shall be."

And again:

The schedule embodied in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of the first day of January.

In each instance the language of the statute is not permissive; it is not optional, it is not a mere authorization; it is a mandate, a specific directive. That is the law of the land and that law has

been in force since 1925. The first question before us today is, whether we shall comply with the law.

The second question is whether we will finish the job.

In compliance with this law, Congress has made two appropriations for the purpose of starting the work—one of \$650,000, carried in the First Supplemental National Defense Act, approved December 23, 1943, and the second of \$7,250,000, carried in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, approved June 28, 1944.

With this money the work on the agricultural census has been started, with the understanding that additional money would be provided when needed. Offices have been rented, equipment has been installed, schools of instruction have been held and supervisors are now recruiting enumerators to visit every farm in America in the next 2 months. Approximately \$4,000,000 of the original appropriations has been spent and the \$6,784,000 carried in this bill is the amount required to complete the job. Unless this money is provided all that has been invested up to this time is a total loss. It is as if we had appropriated money to build a house and now refuse money to put a roof on the house.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that provision in the organic law passed in 1925, to which the gentleman referred, was passed by a Republican-controlled Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; it was passed by a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and signed by a Republican President, so that there can be no partisanship involved in this proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that Secretary Jardine, a Republican Secretary of Agriculture, specifically and enthusiastically approved and supported the law in question that Republican Members of this House are so frantically attempting to defeat?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every Secretary of Agriculture since the enactment of the law, regardless of party, has approved and endorsed the law, and insisted upon its comprehensive administration.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Amplifying further, has it occurred to the gentleman that the conditions today are entirely different from those existing at that time when there was no manpower shortage? It was just the reverse of what it is today. We did not have these A. A. A. agencies and we did not have other agencies taking the census and preparing the data, and we were not in a war when every individual's energy is needed in an all-out war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, the advisability or the expediency of taking the census is not really germane to this question. That has been previously and authoritatively determined too often to require its discussion here. But in response to the suggestions of the gentleman from Michigan, may I say that never before in the history of the country has it been so important that we take a farm census as at this time. Agricultural conditions have been completely dislocated and disorganized by the war. Farm conditions are so different and have changed so materially under the impact of the war that it is particularly necessary that we take this census in order to have information which we can effectively secure in no other way. It is especially important at this time in order to plan for the post-war period. Everybody agrees, and every business organization in the country insists, that we begin planning for post-war economy. It is impossible to make plans either for agriculture or industry without an accurate knowledge of the agricultural situation. This bill provides for the acquisition of that knowledge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the observation about the war made by the gentleman from Michigan, I do not know of any activity that plays a more important part in the war than agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. General Marshall corroborates what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said. He tells us that food is as essential as gun powder in winning the war.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am sure that the gentleman is aware of the fact that recently this House renewed the Post-War Policy and Planning Committee.

One of the subcommittees of that committee set up by this House is charged with the responsibility of trying to work out a post-war program for agriculture. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri, who is a farmer himself, and who has given the problems of agriculture great study, if any committee can wisely undertake and effectively carry out that job unless we have some facts in connection with the disturbed agricultural situation we are now facing in the midst of this war?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No plan for either the immediate or the long-distance future can be made without an accurate knowledge of our agricultural assets and activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I shall take 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think what the gentleman says is absolutely true. That is the reason I voted for the rule and why I am going to vote for the appropriation. But what I cannot understand is that if agriculture is as important as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts says it is, why has it not been declared an essential industry by the President in connection with the matter of drafting labor? I would be interested to hear from the distinguished gentleman later. Perhaps he can explain that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Speaking for myself, and without a farm in my district, I think that during my 17 years in this Congress I have had a pretty good voting record on behalf of the farmers of the country. I take a lot of pride in my record.

Mr. KNUTSON. We appreciate what the gentleman has done, but what I asked the gentleman was, Why has not agriculture been declared an essential industry?

Mr. McCORMACK. Agriculture, ab initio, from the beginning, is an essential industry.

Mr. KNUTSON. Tell that to the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am telling it to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I already know it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I observe that agriculture is essential to the war effort by virtue of the fact that both Houses of Congress have heretofore adopted the Tydings amendment. It is not necessary for the President or anyone else to declare that agriculture is essential.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Minnesota is usually on sound ground, and he is on sound ground in supporting this rule and the joint resolution. As to his comment, on the labor situation, that does not apply as labor is not a factor. The labor employed in the taking of the census is not engaged in either farm production or the war program during the two months the enumerators are in the field.

So far as farm labor is concerned, the Tydings amendment, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] well says, is still in effect.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is aware of the fact, is he not, that one of the contentions that has been made repeatedly by the gentleman and many others is that many farms throughout the country have been abandoned because of inability to get manpower or because of machinery shortages, and so on, and that in planning for the post-war period it ought to be very essential to know and understand the acreage that has gone out of production? Does not the gentle-

man believe it is essential that we know the acreage that was in production and that has gone out of production in the last 2 years due to the impact of the war and otherwise?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is part of the data we expect to secure through this census.

Mr. KEEFE. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the very material which is put out by the Census Bureau there is a specific instruction that farms abandoned or idle in both 1944 and 1945 are not to be enumerated on this schedule. Can the gentleman tell us why the enumerators are not permitted to enumerate the farms that have been abandoned, and so give us that information?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For the reason that the total acreage has long been established. When we have enumerated those which are under cultivation it is a simple matter to determine the number that are not under cultivation.

In response to the question the gentleman has raised, let me say again, and permit me to emphasize it, that the question of the contribution of labor to the war is not involved. No man is accepted for this work who is not cleared by the War Manpower Commission. That was brought out in the testimony and that is the practice that has invariably been followed.

As a matter of fact, most of the enumerators who have been accepted up to this time have been women who are not engaged in industrial occupations or have been farmers who are in winter quarters the first 2 months of the year. In January and February there are practically no farm duties except the farm chores. The enumerators follow their own time schedules. They are not paid by the day and are not paid mileage. It is piecework. They have so many farms to visit and 2 months in which to visit them. They attend to the chores at home and devote such part of the day as they wish to enumeration. The work of the census will not take a single man away from war work. It will not subtract from the farm a single unit of manpower which could be used or is needed in the operation of the farm. So we may discard once for all the question which has been emphasized so strongly in the debate in opposition to the rule.

In response to the suggestion that the department already has the information to be compiled by the census and there is no need for a census, permit me to cite letters which I have here from the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator. They came unsolicited.

The Secretary of Agriculture writes:

In agriculture as in any business activity it is necessary to have a periodic inventory to show where we are and it is especially important in time of war. Production in agriculture as you know in recent years has broken all previous records of production despite difficulties in getting labor, machinery, and fertilizer. A census of agriculture at this time would give information about production in 1944 and will provide a benchmark for many other programs that will be necessary in reconversion.

And may I have the attention of those who have insisted that we have other

means of securing this information. The Secretary of Agriculture says further:

The Department of Agriculture currently collects a large body of statistics about agriculture but these cannot replace the statistics supplied by a census. In fact the census figures provide the basis for backing up the Department's estimates.

Here is his letter in full:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 29, 1945.

DEAR MR. CANNON: I understand that House Joint Resolution 85, providing for additional appropriations for the census of agriculture, is under consideration. I hope that the Congress will enact this resolution.

In agriculture, as in any business activity, it is necessary to have a periodic inventory to show where we are, and this is especially important in times of rapid change. Agriculture, as you know, in recent years has broken all previous records for production despite the difficulties of getting labor, machinery, and fertilizers. A census of agriculture at this time, with information about production in 1944, will provide a bench mark for many of the programs that will be necessary for reconversion.

The Department of Agriculture currently collects a large body of statistics about agriculture, but these cannot replace the statistics supplied by a census. In fact, the census figures provide a basis for trueing up the Department's estimates. In addition, they provide figures for townships and counties, whereas many of the current estimates which the Department prepares are of necessity only for States and the Nation.

There has been close collaboration between technicians of the Department of Agriculture and those of the Bureau of the Census with a view to avoiding duplication and thus reducing cost and also with a view to providing for the maximum usefulness of the information to be collected by the census. There has been continuous consultation between the technicians and the representatives of action agencies within the Department of Agriculture to find how the needs of these agencies could best be met. Now that field work on the census has begun, the field staffs of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the Extension Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are cooperating with the field staff of the Bureau of the Census.

The provision of a more accurate benchmark for post-war planning activities is one of the vital services which the 1945 census of agriculture can and should render. Recent hearings conducted by congressional committees well illustrate the need for such information. In the course of the hearings on the future of cotton, it was apparent that if the most urgent questions are to be answered, information is needed on the amount of cotton grown in low- and high-producing areas and on small and large farms, from those which grow less than one bale up to those which grow as many as 500 bales. It is necessary also to have information on the extent to which alternative crops have been developed in areas which formerly produced cotton, on the speed with which mechanization is proceeding, and on the incomes and welfare of farmers growing cotton. Testifying recently before a Senate Committee on farm housing, I pointed out how the farm-housing problem relates to the whole agricultural problem. Much of the information which I presented to the committee was based on the 1940 census and it would have been helpful if we could have brought it up-to-date with the 1945 census. In my testimony before the House Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, I had occasion to outline some of the policies and problems of agriculture in the post-war period. If we are to deal adequately with those and with the questions raised in the report of that committee,

we need to have information on the incomes of farm families, on the extent to which farmers work part-time off the farm, the number of old farm operators who may be expected to retire and make way for younger operators, the growth of mechanization, as well as on the increased production of crops and livestock. These few instances illustrate how, in my opinion, the census of agriculture at this time should and can help in supplying the information which is needed in dealing adequately with the agricultural problems that lie ahead.

The action agencies in the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration need much of the information which the census can provide. For example, the Farm Credit Administration needs to have county data on property values, on production, on farm incomes, on mortgage debt, on farmers' investment in equipment, on the age and tenure of the operators and on the extent of part-time employment of farm operators. The Rural Electrification Administration needs information on the coverage of all electric service in rural areas and the economic feasibility of extending the service to areas not now covered. The Forest Service needs information on the extent of farm forest resources and the amount of forest products taken from the farm for home use and for sale. The Extension Service, especially the county agents, need a large amount of information by townships and counties to assist the farmers whom they are serving. Other illustrations might be given, but these will indicate something of the range of data which our action agencies need and hope to get from the census of agriculture. If the Census were to get all of the information requested by the action agencies, the schedule would need to be very much longer than it is now.

Through the close cooperation between the staffs of the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Agriculture in all phases of the planning of the 1945 census, full account has been taken of the information already being collected in the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration. The census goes to every farm in every township and county in the United States. With such information as a background, we can and do collect a large amount of current information from a sample of the farmers on the basis of which we prepare national and State estimates. Local groups of farmers need these figures but they need also to have information about their own localities.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

Permit me to read also from a letter by Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, than whom I am certain no man has to a greater degree the confidence of both sides of the House due to his long service in this body and his complete knowledge of the agricultural situation through his long chairmanship of the Committee on Agriculture. In his letter just received he says:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
February 2, 1945.

DEAR CLARENCE: It has been brought to my attention that House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture is now under consideration. While it is possible that this data may not be assembled in time to be of special advantage to the operations of the War Food Administration, we think it is proper to call your attention to the following facts.

Agricultural statistics heretofore gathered have been indispensable in planning and administering wartime agricultural programs.

Since the beginning of the war in Europe we have asked the farmers of the country to make many changes in their practices. We have asked for and received large increases in the production of such crops as soybeans, peanuts, and flax because they were needed for carrying on the war. The production of many other crops and of livestock and livestock products was increased at the request of the Federal Government. Some new crops, such as hemp, were grown.

When the special needs of wartime have been met farmers will face many problems of reconversion. I believe that the Federal Government is obligated to have the necessary facts and programs ready to help farmers make the shift to a peacetime production pattern. As I understand it, the 1945 census of agriculture would provide much of the factual data which will be needed in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

In this connection, let me quote also from a statement by Secretary W. M. Jardine, Secretary of Agriculture under President Hoover, in support of the 5-year farm census. Secretary Jardine said in a statement dated February 25, 1928, and addressed to the chairman of the House Census Committee:

The agricultural census is so important to our work and to the work of other agricultural agencies, not to speak of its extensive utilization by innumerable manufacturing and commercial interests, that I feel justified in emphasizing the point of view expressed * * * in the accompanying memorandum.

The memorandum referred to presents the portion of Secretary Jardine's recommendation on the bill providing for the quinquennial census of agriculture:

It might appear to the uninitiated that we are giving undue emphasis to unimportant considerations. Only those who are continually employing these statistics realize how vital and important they are not only to the agricultural interests of the Nation but to a large proportion of the other business interests.

In addition to the direct use which the farmer makes of the census statistics, he also benefits indirectly through the use made of these materials by the various agencies which are working in his interest. From time immemorial farmers have been at a disadvantage because of inadequate knowledge of what to produce, when to produce it, and when and where to sell their product. A great many manufacturing and commercial agencies are well equipped with such information. They are not jumping in the dark as the farmer is compelled to do. He has the uncertainty not only as to how much he himself will produce as affected by weather and other conditions, but also as to what his competitors, the other farmers in this and other countries, are doing or are going to do. It is not too much to say that whatever can be done toward stabilizing agriculture will depend absolutely on having adequate statistical data concerning the factors of agricultural production, the acreage planted or to be planted, the volume of production and the disposition of the products.

The agricultural census is the most important single statistical document for agriculture. It provides an inventory or cross section every 5 or 10 years of the productive resources and current status of the agricultural industry. It, therefore, provides the basic data for research work in agricultural economics and for extension work.

While the census comes only every 5 years, formerly only every 10 years, it constitutes the basis for an adequate system of annual

statistics and monthly crop and livestock estimates. It would, of course, be more desirable to have an annual census, but this would probably be too expensive. Therefore we have developed the system of supplementing the information in the census by annual estimates which have as their point of departure the data enumerated in the census of agriculture. In order to keep these estimates from getting out of line it is necessary to check them back every five years to an actual enumeration. Otherwise the errors in estimating crop acreage or numbers of livestock would be carried forward and exaggerated in the annual estimates, resulting in a cumulative percentage of error. In other words, the census and the annual estimates are interdependent and both are necessary.

The agricultural census provides the most important body of economic information concerning the economic life of the Nation. It is more important than the manufacturing census because it is much more detailed and because the products of agriculture constitute the materials of manufacture and trade.

Statisticians realize that the fluctuations in agricultural production exert a most powerful influence on the variations in the business cycle and affect almost every current of economic life. The census is, therefore, of tremendous significance for the business man. It provides cotton manufacturers, cereal merchants and millers, and other processors with information concerning the raw materials employed in their business. Mail-order house and other commercial agencies are vitally interested in the buying power of farmers in various sections of the country and are anxious to know the amount of product which the farmer has produced and the price he is receiving for it in various areas. Railroads need to know how much is to be produced, or is likely to be produced, so that they can make their arrangements to haul the product to market. Bankers find that the success or failure of crops in the various parts of the country has tremendous influence on the volume of credit required, the amount of reserves to be kept, and the general condition of the money market; and other credit agencies lending to farmers are vitally concerned with such information.

Sometimes the statement is made that speculators are the only people who profit by the agricultural information in the census, as well as by the information put out by the division of crop and livestock estimates of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. There is no greater mistake than this. Almost every line of legitimate business is concerned with these materials. However, even in the case of speculation it is in the interest both of the farmer and of other classes of business that speculation shall be as intelligent as possible. Insofar as speculation is intelligent it makes for prices justified by conditions of supply and demand, present and prospective. Inasmuch as it is unintelligent it results in erratic markets and market conditions.

While it is true that these agricultural statistics are not directly used by the majority of individual farmers, it is possible for the research and extension agencies to organize the statistical information from this and other sources in such a manner as to throw a great deal of light on the outlook for the various lines of agricultural production and to take this information to the individual farmer. The work is only in its infancy, but it represents a line of development which agricultural leaders for a half century or more have recognized as essential if the farmer's business is to be placed on a plane of intelligent action in any manner comparable with that enjoyed by other lines of business.

The interpretation of the highly complex data concerning production and marketing conditions and outlook is a job of great technical difficulty, wholly beyond the range and

abilities of the individual farmer. Existing technical agencies are trying to translate these facts into their actual significance and bearing on the farmer's business, so that he will not continue to be at a disadvantage as compared with other classes of producers. It is desirable not only to interpret the outlook but also to aid the farmer to determine the relationship of the existing outlook to the proper readjustments called for in the type of farming which he pursues. This implies a knowledge of the systems of farming in the various parts of the country, and the agricultural census is the most important source of information along this line.

Some people have the impression that these statistics and the interpretation made of them, as well as the technical activities of the Department of Agriculture, only injure the farmer by helping to increase his production. It is desirable to correct the impression that because we have the surplus problem it is not worth while to help the farmer improve his productiveness. Every kind of improvement which helps the farmer lower his cost of production, either by better technical methods or by more effective adjustment of his plans to market conditions, enables him to compete to better advantage with producers in other countries and increase his chance of making a profit. If the resulting production is excessive, the remedy is to reduce the acreage and amount of labor employed in agriculture, but not to decrease the efficiency of the individual farmer on the land. Both the Nation as a whole and the farmer as a producer are vitally interested in bringing the level of efficiency of agriculture up to the highest point possible; and accurate statistics, of which the census of agriculture is the essential foundation, will be of the utmost importance in contributing to this result.

Going a little farther back in order to include every administration in the last half century, we have a strong statement to the same effect by Secretary James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture from 1897 to 1913 under Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft, in support of a census of agriculture at 5-year intervals.

In testifying before the House Census Committee on a bill providing for a 5-year census of agriculture, which was first taken in 1925 during the Coolidge administration, Secretary Wilson said:

There is no reason given for the midway census of manufactures that does not apply with much greater force to agricultural products. * * * Before there was a permanent Census Bureau provided for, the Department of Agriculture had been for many years in the habit of making estimates of these products. But the time between decennial censuses is too long, because the increase of production in one class of products and the decrease or possible standstill in production of another might have a very great influence on the producer and the dealer in the United States. The benefit that would come to the Department of Agriculture would be that instead of having once in 10 years a reliable basis for estimating, we should have it once in 5 years. * * * The reason why I should like to see the average census taken every 5 years is that we could then make more intelligent annual estimates and be less likely to report wide of the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified at the expiration of 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as to the very pertinent statements which have been made and reiterated, and will no doubt continue to

be emphasized, that we already have this information or that it can be secured through the A. A. A., or through the Extension Service or other agency, let me say it is impossible to use the A. A. A. for such purpose, for the reason that they have only statistics relating to the farms which are under the A. A. A. program. Many farms throughout the United States have not conformed to the A. A. A. program, and we would have no data on them. Furthermore, even those which have participated in the A. A. A. program have information available only on certain crops. They have nothing on livestock; they have nothing on fruit; they have nothing on vegetables; they have nothing on hay; they have nothing on many crops, many items of production that we must understand in order to plan for the future.

Furthermore, all employees of the A. A. A. are on a per diem basis. If the A. A. A. were to do the job it would take more money to have the A. A. A. secure this information than it would for the Bureau of Census to compile it.

The suggestion that the county agents take the census is out of the question. The State extension services are not equipped or staffed to take a census. As a matter of fact the county agents are already overworked and would not have time to employ or supervise the enumeration. If they were to take the census they would have to employ as many enumerators at as high salaries, and would have to do over the work already done by the Census Bureau.

Furthermore, it is not along their line of endeavor. The census should be by an impartial agency, not by some agency handling an action program, and which is interested in selling its program to the country. The Census Bureau is adequately equipped. That is their business. We might as well expect our barber to service our automobiles or ask the plumber to shave us as to ask the Extension Service or the A. A. A. or the O. P. A. to take a census.

If further evidence to this effect is required it is supplied by the following letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
February 5, 1945.

The question of having the field staff of the Department of Agriculture take the census is one that has been frequently discussed. If it were the intent of Congress to have that done, suitable arrangements could be worked out. Under the present arrangements, however, the field staff of the agricultural agencies has clearly specified functions and the funds from which they are paid are limited both in amount and in the purposes for which they can be used, and their work is limited to these.

As I understand it, the major part of the costs is that which results from the actual collection of schedules in the field. This cost would be altered very little if persons other than the enumerators now being employed were to be used. In nearly every agricultural county there are three groups of people who work closely with Federal agricultural agencies; the A. A. A. committeemen, the volunteer neighborhood and community leaders working with the Extension Service, and the volunteer crop reporters who supply much of the current statistical infor-

mation to the Department. No one of these groups is large enough to take over the job of enumeration.

Agricultural Adjustment Agency committeemen are paid a per diem when actually performing work for the A. A. A. If they were to be appointed as census enumerators, obviously they would need to be paid for the time required to do that job. The neighborhood and community leaders assisting the Extension Service are volunteers, so are the crop reporters. They do not receive pay for the services they render. If the responsibility for collecting the census schedules were to be given to either of these groups, funds would have to be made available to pay them.

My information is that in actual practice a good many persons who have had service with the A. A. A., the Extension Service, or as crop reporters are actually on your staff as census enumerators.

Any proposal that county, State, or regional workers of the Department could fill the supervisory jobs assumes that most of them could be taken away from their present work for a period of 4 to 6 months. No doubt there are some individuals who can render such assistance, but the number of such people is too limited to provide the supervisory staff which you need. As you know, members of the field staff of the Department are co-operating with the Census organization in many ways and the possibility of releasing staff members to assist with the job of census taking has been rather fully explored.

We need the census data as bench mark statistics to keep our own estimates in line. Many of our current estimates provide an adequate basis for State, regional, and national figures, but for most county figures it is still necessary to go to the Census. The farther we get away from the last census, the less satisfactory are the county figures which are available.

The need for figures for counties and townships is an ever-present one. Local groups of all kinds are constantly in need of figures for their own counties. As planning groups get more deeply into the problems of agricultural adjustments when wartime crops are no longer so urgently needed, there will be an even greater demand for county figures of all kinds, and especially on the production of such wartime crops as soybeans, peanuts, flax, etc.

In many of our studies of adjustments and of the effects of proposed programs, it is necessary for us to be able to combine counties into some regional units. These may be type-of-farming areas, they may be land-use adjustment areas, watersheds, or other regions, including only some portions of States. Unless we have the county data so that the figures for the appropriate counties can be combined, it would be necessary to make many highly unsatisfactory estimates for such areas.

I need not point out to you very many uses by farmers, farmers' organizations, marketing agencies, sales organizations, radios, newspapers, advertisers, and others for the figures for counties and smaller areas which are supplied by the Census. I am sure you must have many more requests from such groups for these materials than we have.

Sincerely yours,

H. R. TOLLEY, *Chief.*

Perhaps the most convincing statement on the subject is an excerpt from the report released January 14, 1945, by the Bureau of the Census, and quoted by my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who cited the report as proof that we already have data on hand which renders a further inquiry for agricultural information, by the Bureau of the Census, or other agency, unnecessary.

Here is a paragraph from the report to which he refers which he evidently overlooks:

Because of sampling errors, relatively small numbers for either date (1940 and 1944) and small changes between the two dates, which were indicated by the accompanying estimates, are not trustworthy.

The various agencies of the Department of Agriculture which issue estimates on farm production, resources, activities, and conditions, make the best guess they can but cannot be expected to even approach accuracy without the quinquennial count by the Bureau of the Census on every farm in the Nation to serve as bench marks.

Who, Mr. Chairman, can plan the future of the Nation without adequate information? Must we drop back into the abyss into which agriculture and the country plunged after the last war? Or shall we adopt some measures which will aid in preventing a recurrence of that catastrophe? We must have accurate and dependable data to guide us, and it can be secured only through the official census provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, every business, industrial, labor-economic, and labor organization in America is requesting this census. The agricultural press is especially unanimous in its endorsement of this bill.

The following letters are typical:

CAPPER PUBLICATIONS,
January 8, 1944.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that there is a possibility of a 1945 census of agriculture with particular reference to its population and housing. We would like to go on record as believing that this would be of very great value to the Nation.

Never in our experience have we found the interdependence of agriculture and industry so much in the consciousness of all those who are responsible for management and policies in American business.

It is supremely important that basic information on the whole agricultural situation be kept as up to date as possible and a 1945 agricultural census of any and all phases of its tremendous ramifications, would be of very real value at this time.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP ZACH,
Director of Advertising,
Capper Publications, Inc.

CAPPER-HARMAN-SLOCUM, INC.,
February 11, 1944.

On January 10, we wrote to you, expressing our wish that the 1945 census of agriculture be made as originally planned, and although we have had no word on anything that may have developed, we hope that this may be done.

Under normal conditions we could get along reasonably well as publishers of three farm papers with a minimum of data on agriculture, but the more critical the situation; the more necessary this data becomes and agriculture in general has never faced before a situation so critical as it faces now.

We have done our part, we believe, reasonably well in the reduction of the use of paper, both in our publications and in our other operations, where we have reduced this use to a minimum, eliminating many things that we have done regularly in the past—requiring the use of paper.

Very truly,

CAPPER-HARMAN-SLOCUM, INC.,
NEFF LAING, General Manager.

AMERICAN POULTRY JOURNAL,
January 28, 1945.

I would like to add a hearty voice of approval to your attitude that a 1945 census is needed especially because it is an abnormal year. We have the 1940 census for a normal pre-war picture and when this war is over we will want the 1945 census for the abnormal conditions.

It is my sincere belief that if there is any substance to the argument that we must plan for the post-war period, an agricultural census of the war period will be essential to that planning.

Being a taxpayer, right in the midst of figuring my income tax, I am not too enthusiastic about increasing Government expenditures but I believe firmly that there are certain functions that the Government needs to carry on even at times such as these when the war is a drain on the Treasury. Taking the census, in my opinion, is a governmental function that should not be curtailed. The money spent on that is well spent.

Sincerely yours,

AMERICAN POULTRY JOURNAL,
L. M. KLEVAY.

AGRICULTURAL PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION.

February 3, 1944.

This letter comes to you on behalf of the 34 farm publication members of this association, these publications having a combined circulation of 11,750,000.

The publishers of these farm papers, meeting here in Chicago, January 26, were agreed that a 1945 census of agriculture will be of tremendous value to a very great number of people in this industry. It was pointed out particularly that essential facts brought together next year will give us an opportunity to make comparisons with conditions in 1940, in pre-war times, and then with post-war conditions in 1950.

It was the unanimous feeling of our member publishers that the bringing together of agricultural statistics in 1945 is a matter of sufficient importance that this office was instructed to write you, urging that everything be done to bring about that end and offering to cooperate in every possible way.

Sincerely yours,

LYOYD BURLINGHAM.

(The Washington Farmer, the Idaho Farmer, the Oregon Farmer, California Cultivator, the Montana Farmer, the Utah Farmer, Arizona Farmer)

ASSOCIATED FARM PAPERS,
January 28, 1944.

My publishers represented in this letterhead; and I hope that there is definitely to be a 1945 general census. I write you because we have heard some rumors to the effect that this census may be postponed to the 1950 date.

Such a postponement would be particularly lamentable. It would put us in the position of being pretty much in the dark in a 10-year period during which we have engaged in a world cataclysm and the resultant changes and distortions of our normal, if there is such a thing, procedures.

The word "normal" suggests to me the abnormality prevailing now and the fact that a census in 1945 would have the profound position in history of having examined our population precisely under these abnormal conditions.

A 1945 general census would then give us in the years to come a yardstick in our history to look back on. You know, we shall want to look back in 1950 at this period—1940-45—with the yearning to know a lot about it. Only if a general census in 1945 is available will we be able to do so.

Sincerely yours,

FRED O. TOOF,
National Advertising Manager.

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
February 1, 1944.

We have learned with great satisfaction that there are tentative plans for a 1945 census of agriculture and we are writing to express our very earnest hope that these tentative plans will become definite soon.

We have found each census of agriculture of increasing value to our sales department, to our editors, and to our advertisers. And we feel that there is an even greater need for a census of agriculture in 1945 than there has been for the very helpful ones of the past. The war's effects upon farm buying power, upon the availability of and the market for manufactured goods, upon farming practices, etc., seem to make a 1945 census of agriculture a necessity in order to provide up-to-date information on the farm market—information that is urgently needed by the farm press, by business, and by all agencies who serve agriculture and who are served by it.

Sincerely yours,

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
FOWLER DUGGER,
Advertising Manager.

FARM JOURNAL AND FARMER'S WIFE,

March 3, 1944.

Thank you for your letter of February 29 and for the information with reference to frozen foods. This is most helpful.

As you suggest, I shall also contact the War Food Administration for the information they have.

Incidentally, I thought you might be interested in a copy of a letter which I am writing to the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee and to our own Senators and Representatives in Congress, urging them to insert in H. R. 4024 provision for the taking of a 1945 census of agriculture. I feel this information is very basic, particularly during these times, and I hope that the Congress will deny the Budget Bureau's proposal that this census be eliminated and will instead make the necessary funds available.

Again many thanks for your fine cooperation in connection with the frozen-foods figures and for the many courtesies you folks have extended to us in the past. You're doing a great job.

Cordially yours,

H. F. E. JEUNET,
Research and Sales Promotion Manager

THE FARMER,

St. Paul, Minn., January 7, 1944.

We understand that there is some question about making a 1945 census of agriculture because of the very abnormal conditions prevailing during wartime.

The same question was raised in early 1934 about the then forthcoming census of agriculture for 1935 because of the devastation and havoc wrought by the drouth which would make conditions subnormal at the census period. The census proved to be a very interesting analysis of the changes that had taken place especially in the utilization of land under adverse conditions.

The 1945 census should reveal a very interesting comparison with the decennial census of 1940. The 1940 figures show pre-war conditions while the 1945 figures would give us data on agricultural production under all-out war conditions. Such a comparison may prove to be of great historical importance sometime in the future, besides the value of it in determining changes for increased war production, if we are still at war, or for the basis of post-war planning when hostilities cease.

We also believe that it would be inadvisable to break the census cycles. That might be an unfortunate precedent and certainly would throw the data out of balance through the inability of showing developments or changes between agricultural periods.

It is our considered opinion that a 1945 agricultural census should be conducted regardless of the present abnormal conditions or the unusual difficulties you naturally will face in conducting the census at this time.

Sincerely yours,

THE FARMER,
HORACE C. KLEIN.

THE PRAIRIE FARMER,
January 28, 1944.

I am writing to urge that your Bureau go through with a 1945 census of agriculture. It seems to me it is important in these times to have the proper information and figures as a guide to farm conditions during the war.

A 1945 census would be very valuable to compare with 1940 and again in 1950.

We sincerely hope that your Bureau will be able to carry through in 1945.

Very truly yours,

J. E. EDWARDS,
Advertising Manager.

THE ARIZONA FARMER,
February 14, 1944.

I would like to add my own recommendation to those made to you by other publishers that there is a vital need for a 1945 general farm census.

Conditions are changing so rapidly in the farm field that the 1940 figures bear little resemblance to operations nowadays. At least ours do not.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE H. POWELL,
Manager.

THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,
January 31, 1944.

Because of the vital light it will throw on a rapidly changing picture, will you please use your full influence at the right sources to see that a 1945 census is taken?

Such a census would be of tremendous benefits to the farming communities of this country. Daily the import of this grows upon us as we come in contact with those who are producing our food, feed, and fiber for victory.

Thank you for your help in this direction.

Yours very truly,

THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,
DEWEY H. NEAL,
Advertising Manager.

(The Washington Farmer, the Oregon Farmer, the Idaho Farmer)

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FARM TRIO,
February 26, 1944.

Thank you for the information in your letter of February 21 in which you outline the situation as regards the 1945 agricultural census, and the likelihood that it may not be taken because of the lack of an appropriation to pay for the work.

Our publications here in Spokane make extensive use of the data secured in the periodic farm censuses; and we sincerely hope that the money will still be appropriated to finance the 1945 census.

Your good cooperation in supplying us with needed statistics from time to time is keenly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FARM TRIO,
RALPH E. DYAR, Promotion Director.

THE WESTERN FARM LIFE,
January 13, 1944.

It is our understanding that consideration is now being given to the possibility of conducting a 1945 census of agriculture. Both our editorial department and our advertising department use such information extensively and we would just like to go on record as favoring, in fact needing the mate-

rial such as the census would contain, if it is possible to conduct one under wartime conditions.

We sincerely appreciate the problems you will be faced with in collecting and handling this data under present-day conditions and we trust it will be possible for this service to be continued.

Very truly yours,
THE WESTERN FARM LIFE,
E. M. McKIM,
Advertising Manager.

THE SPOKESMAN-REVIEW,
January 21, 1944.

The question came up the other day as to whether there will be in 1945 a census of agriculture, a census of distribution.

These would be of great value to the Cowles publications and we'd appreciate any advance notice you can give us as to the plans of the Census Bureau regarding same. Thanking you for any information you can give at this time, we are

Very truly yours,
RALPH E. DYAR,
Promotion Director, Cowles Publications.

THE NEBRASKA FARMER,
February 11, 1944.

We sincerely hope that the 1945 agricultural census will be taken as usual next year. We understand that there is some possibility that this census may be deferred because of the war and, we believe, such deferment would be a mistake.

So many changes have occurred as a result of the war that it has been quite impossible to visualize agricultural conditions accurately. Also, there will be a readjustment after the war, which will make another change. We believe that an agricultural census in 1945 is even more important than in normal times.

Very sincerely yours,
GLENN BUCK,
Associate Publisher.

THE MONTANA FARMER,
February 3, 1944.

We have been somewhat concerned over reports that there is some question about carrying out the regular census of 1945. We hope these reports are erroneous and that it will be possible for your department to make the usual 5-year census survey next year. We make very extensive use of statistical material developed by the census and a gap in this program would very seriously interfere with the issuance of statistical reports which we make to an extensive list of advertisers and other institutions.

We hope it will be possible for you to send us assurance that the 1945 census will be carried out in accordance with the regular schedule.

Yours very truly,
LESTER COLE, Editor.

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER Co.,
February 29, 1944.

We have just learned that there is some question as to whether or not a 1945 mid-decennial agricultural census is going to be taken. From the attached copy of a letter addressed to Senator CARTER GLASS you will notice that we are urging that an appropriation should be made for the taking of this census.

At the same time we are calling this to the attention of the Farm Equipment Institute, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., and suggesting that all members of the institute should write a similar appeal to Senator GLASS. If there is anything else we can do to stress the importance of this census to

the Senator, please advise us and we will attempt to use our influence accordingly.

Very truly yours,
INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER Co.,
By J. M. STRASSER,
Supervisor, Market Analysis
and Consumer Research.

FARM EQUIPMENT INSTITUTE,
March 6, 1944.

Thank you very much for your letter of the 4th, enclosing copies of chapters III and IV of the Agriculture Handbook.

In the second paragraph of your letter you referred to the list of farm machinery studies which were made for Government agencies. If copies of these are available, we would like very much to obtain them.

You will also refer to tabulations made for individuals or firms. It is possible that we would like to have some studies made for us on certain points, and would appreciate your indicating the basis on which such studies may be made; that is, whether this is a per diem charge, and if so, how much.

By the way, it has been reported that there is a possibility that the 1945 census of agriculture may be passed up. Do you think this is likely to be the case or do you feel that census will be made as usual?

In view of the exceptional record made by agriculture during the war period and the need of pertinent information as a guide for the post-war period, it would seem most desirable to have the middecennial census taken as usual.

Yours very truly,
ROBERT A. JONES.

THE CLEVELAND TRACTOR Co.,
March 10, 1944.

This letter is being written with regard to the article on page 20 of the March 1, 1944, issue of Sales Management—Agricultural Census in 1945.

We are in complete accord with Mr. Philip Sallsbury and certainly feel that it is vital that we have a census of the machinery and other equipment on farms in order to judge more accurately the replacement markets in the post-war period as well as all of the agricultural statistics on crops and livestock by counties. In other words, we too protest vigorously in dispensing with the census.

We sincerely trust that it will be made available to those of us to whom it is of vital importance.

Sincerely,
THE CLEVELAND TRACTOR Co.,
L. D. OGLE, Assistant Sales Manager,
Agricultural Division.

Mr. Chairman, every other group of trade publication in the country is as unanimously in favor of this bill. I ask the gentlemen who have today opposed the bill to cite a single reputable national organization of any character opposing it. I ask them to cite a single editorial in any newspaper in the United States opposing this bill. I ask them to submit here an authentic statement from any prominent businessman, from any public official, from any economist, engineer or author of national prominence, opposing this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is no opposition to this bill anywhere in the United States except on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 5 additional minutes.

Under the rule, the gentleman from

New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at the outset I ought to observe—and I think your own observation will coincide—that a rather distressing attitude has grown up in Congress. The word "million" does not mean anything any more; we have just knocked out the M and supplanted it with a B and we have thought so long and earnestly in terms of billions that it becomes rather difficult for us, I suppose, to orient our thinking to a little bill that involves \$6,750,000. But as we go along, Mr. Chairman, we have got to reorient our thinking. A million dollars is still a lot of money out in my country; I think it is still a lot of money in every section of the country. Perhaps we ought to sit at the feet of Dr. Einstein and develop some practical ideas of relativity. When I think of the six-and-three-quarters-odd millions involved here I think in terms of the entire tax take by the Federal Government in the form of income tax from thirty or forty thousand American families. This helps me get my feet on the ground. The amount of money involved here will probably be the equivalent of the total income tax that is squeezed out of the 35,000 families in the city of Peoria, Ill.; and since it is almost an incidental function it takes on some new significance for me. That is not quite the whole story.

Originally there was supplied in the First Supplemental Defense Appropriation bill \$650,000, obviously to initiate this census program. After a while we added \$7,200,000. When the census people got into the field and found they could not get enumerators for an average of 89 cents a schedule; which plus overtime would be about \$1.02 per schedule, they came back for this deficiency that is before us today. There thus will be expended on this agricultural census something like \$14,750,000. That is a lot of money for a census in only one field of American endeavor. That is the proposition before us.

Let us look at the status of this activity for a moment. They tell us that something like \$2,000,000 has been obligated. This may be right, and it yet may not be exactly right, but let us assume for all practical purposes that \$2,000,000 has been allocated. Then the argument has been advanced that since the law makes it mandatory, since the statute says an agricultural census shall be taken and since area officers have been sent out and some enumerators have been recruited, therefore, ipse dixit we must proceed with this matter. I do not follow that line of reasoning at all. The fact of the matter is that the law does not say when this must be done. It says that a quinquennial census shall be taken; it does not provide a specific date. We can take it in the latter part of 1945 as well as in the first part of 1945. We can devise ways whereby we can save a little

money and still get the information desired.

At the very outset perhaps we should be clear as to what the law really does provide. The authority for an agricultural census is found in title 13, section 216 of the 1940 Code and provides that "there shall be in the year 1935 and once every 10 years thereafter a census of agriculture and livestock which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country."

There you will find the whole mandate in the law. It should be remembered, however, that since Congress enacted the law providing for a census Congress can expressly repeal or can make it inoperative by refusing to provide the funds. I believe that fact is implied in any statute which the Congress might enact. The very fact that the law is quite specific on the items to be surveyed in such a census would indicate that Congress was endeavoring to apply a limitation.

The law does not say a lot of other things that we find in the proposed census. For instance, in the schedule I have, there is a question whether the operator lives on the farm, whether the operator began to operate this farm and so forth. What difference does it make so long as war food is being produced? How many days did the operator work off the farm during 1944 and did he work for pay? Is that essential at this time? They say here that emphasis has got to be placed on the production of food as a munition of war. They also ask the method of rental at a time like this when we are engaged in a war, when we are in a critical period. What difference does it make how a farmer rents, whether it be for cash or on shares? Give the number of stock and machinery owned by the landlord. That is very important, but does it affect the production of war food and the formulation of these programs that they say are before us in fabricating a program for next year? What are the number of occupied and unoccupied dwellings on the farm? Is that so essential? Does the farm have electricity? Does it have running water? Does it have a radio? Does it have a telephone? Well, I could take the last census and answer that because I know how priorities have been handled by the War Production Board. I can tell them from the last census pretty nearly how many telephones there are on the farms of the country right now.

There are questions also about machinery and about tractors, how many boys and girls under 14, how many men and women and boys and girls over 14. You could take the figures of 1940, minus the mortalities, which are all recorded down here, and the Census Bureau could tell you pretty well.

The point I am trying to make is that in the justification for this census the Census Bureau sets forth in its testimony before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies that the information to be obtained in this census "is essential for planning war and post-war programs involving the determination of food allotments, the de-

velopment of food distribution programs, the formulation of price policies, the mobilization of manpower for agriculture, and similar programs."

It is doubtful, therefore, whether a good deal of the information which is required in the forms which have already been prepared has any direct bearing upon the objectives cited to the committee.

Let it be emphatically understood that if a census of this nature is to be taken at this time I have no objection whatsoever to obtaining information on the items now carried in these schedules, but the point must not be overlooked that we are in war. We are constantly spending borrowed funds and it is so eminently proper for the Congress to determine the necessity and the advisability of the census at this time.

I am not one of those who believe that thrift is synonymous with hoarding because there are times when the best kind of thrift is to spend money, nor do I believe that in order to achieve economy there must be an indiscriminate lop-off of Federal functions. I do mean to say, however, that a proper perception of thrift requires prudence in expenditure and that there should be an endeavor to secure value for whatever money is appropriated. It, therefore, behooves us to look at this in a practical and prudent way.

The Census Bureau is going rather far afield in this matter. I contend that as we examine the whole proposition before us we could let this thing lay a little while and see whether or not the people in the Department of Agriculture can ascertain and gather together the essential information upon which to predicate a war food program. We could do that now. Then we could obtain the other data at some later time. I say we can do it now because I think we have the manpower in the various Federal agencies to produce the data which may be essential.

I went back to the agricultural appropriation bill to see just what we do have and I discovered some very interesting things. These are the statements that were given to us on the agricultural appropriation bill for 1945 by the departmental authorities themselves. We had all of them before us, including the Secretary of Agriculture.

We have today 4,050 full-time people in the A. A. A. In addition to that, we have 9,093 county committeemen who operate on a per diem basis. We have 104,700 community committeemen scattered all over the country. In addition to that, the Farm Security Administration has 9,514 people for whom we have appropriated funds and who are presently on the pay roll. Then, to make it even more complete, we have a statistical agency—and it is a good agency—in the Department of Agriculture, called the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. How many people has it on the pay roll? It has 769. Now, by the very simple process of addition, draw a line and what have you? You have 127,000 people identified with agriculture and with the action programs of the Federal Government in every county, in every one of the 3,105 counties of the United States.

Is there anyone here and now who would say that we have got to spend this amount of money to get the information that the statute calls for, namely, the value and number of livestock, the acreage and principal crops and the total acreage? That is what is asked for.

Mr. Chairman, I think I can establish to your satisfaction that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has done a pretty fair job in this field. Every month you get this little document that is known as the Agricultural Situation, gotten out by the Department of Agriculture. This one is dated January 1945.

This issue consists of 25 pages. It contains commodity reviews, tables showing parity prices, a very extensive article on 1945 agricultural goals for commodities and livestock, a general survey of the food situation, a number of articles dealing with the various agricultural sections of the country.

In it you will find estimates on hogs and cattle, on farm labor and poultry, on fruit and soybeans, on food and feed grains, and a host of other material, all of which has been brought down to date by means of spot checks throughout the country.

Most of this information is developed in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Give ear for a moment as I read you from it under the subdivision "Poultry and Eggs" on page 20, an article prepared by Mr. T. S. Thorfinnson of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

The number of hens and pullets in the Plains States on January 1, 1944, was 63.6 million, or 57 percent higher than the average for the 5-year period 1937-41.

Where did they get that figure? They tell you exactly how many chickens there are in the country. They make spot checks from time to time, and I think those would be useful and serve our purpose in devising the war food program that lies immediately ahead. You can examine this and it will give you the figures not for 1940 but for January 1, 1944, and subsequent dates as to how much poultry there is, how many sheep, lambs, hogs, cattle, mules, colts, and bushels of grain of all kinds in storage, under seal, on the farms, in the elevators, and everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It occurs to me from that information we ought to be pretty careful before we go ahead and spend the remaining \$12,750,000. They say you must go ahead. Must you? We put in ten or twelve million dollars to harness the tides of Passamaquoddy but we did not go ahead. We put \$5,000,000 in the Florida Ship Canal, and they still have a lot of bridges scattered along the excavations which were made. But we did not go ahead. We stopped it. We had the C. C. C. tooled up in every section of the country, camps everywhere, at an annual cost of \$250,000,000, and the Congress said, "It shall not go further," and it stopped.

There is an implication in every statute that is enacted, even though it is

mandatory, to proceed with the work only if the funds are made available, and it remains then the function and the power of the lawmaking branch, the guardian of the purse of the country, to determine whether we shall go ahead.

My suggestion is this: I will not quarrel with any mandate of the statute but I will say, let us today by record vote say to Mr. Capt, Director of the Census Bureau, that he talk with Mr. Wickard and with Mr. Jones, War Food Administrator, and see whether or not within the framework and the personnel in these departments the essential information cannot be gotten with a moderate amount of cost. In that way we can still save some money for the taxpayers. Do not forget that the sum represented in this deficiency is the equivalent of the income taxes paid by more than 30,000 American families and if we add to it the funds already appropriated but not expended it will probably be sixty or seventy thousand families.

When all is said and done, the proponents for this bill have not established that it is necessary at this time nor have they met the contention that the essential information as provided by the statute as the basis for our war-food production programs can be obtained more expeditiously and more economically through the personnel and the authority which already lodges in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his argument against the rule a short while ago raised a very pertinent question. He indicated that if he had the justification for this legislation, he would support it. I think he is right in taking this position. We should always have ample justification before enacting any legislation. Therefore, in the very few minutes allotted to me I shall attempt to enumerate a few of the justifications announced when the law was enacted in 1925, providing that this census be taken every 10 years. The first argument made in support of the legislation was that it would enable those engaged in agriculture to better regulate their production program so as to meet or comport more nearly with the demand for crops and livestock. That was primarily for the benefit of the farmer. If it were good for him in 1925, if it were good for him in 1935, why should not the farmer want similar information in 1945 or 1946?

Another argument was that this information is necessary or essential every 5 years to enable the transportation facilities of the country to make arrangements so that wherever there is a surplus production it may be transported to those sections, areas, and markets where it is in demand. Without this information the transportation companies cannot properly facilitate, expedite, and economize on the distribution of farm crops.

Another argument was that such legislation was essential in order for those engaged in distribution of farm crops could operate most efficiently. People

who are engaged in the distribution of farm crops, such as wholesale merchants, people who buy large supplies and distribute them, are anxious to get information as to total production and number of livestock, poultry, and so forth, from time to time in order that they may deal fairly and at the same time insure the farmer a fair and reasonable price for his product and then sell in the best markets. If that were a justification in 1925, when the law was enacted, and in 1935, when the census was taken, why should it not be a justification in 1945, when there is greater disruption and uncertainty as to acreage and agricultural production than at any time in our history?

Another justification for the legislation in 1925 was to prevent and obviate undue speculation in farm crops. There had been built up in this country private reporting agencies. It was to their interest to disseminate information throughout the country that there had been an unprecedented increase in the production of wheat, for example, designed primarily to depress the market.

On the other hand, some other agency would issue a statement that it had obtained information that the wheat crop was seriously damaged and there would be underproduction and they would, therefore, expect an increase in the price. It was to stop or prevent undue speculation in farm crops that this legislation was enacted in 1925, and you can mark my word that if this or similar legislation is not enacted you may expect a similar situation to arise regardless whether the war ends this year or not. All the reasons and other justifications that existed for passing the law in 1925 exist today just as much as at that time, and my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was here at that time and supported the legislation, and my very high regard for him convinces me he will not think hard of me for calling his attention to these justifications for this legislation.

To my mind, the greatest reason for passing this measure at this time is that we are in a war. We have been told that various foods, such as bread, meat coming from slaughtered cattle, hogs, poultry, including eggs, milk, butter, and so forth, are all needed to go into a balanced ration for our men in the armed forces. Suppose you, Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, had charge of distributing food to our armed forces in every nook and corner of this world, to see that every man on the front line was supplied with a sufficient amount of food, a sufficient amount of meat, of bread, and other things that would enable him to go into battle as a strong man; what would you want to know? The first question you would ask would be, "How much breadstuffs is available in this country, and how much was produced last year? I want to know down to the actual pound how much beef is marketable, how much pork is marketable, and how much milk and how much butter is marketable, how many chickens and eggs are available. I want to know where these food products are, because I want to get hold of them to distribute

them to the young men who are fighting the greatest battle of all time."

Without this information we cannot logically expect that sustained momentum necessary in any offensive war effort.

We are told that without this information it would be impossible for those charged with the duty and responsibility of planning and providing the necessary food and clothing requirements of each man in the armed forces would be unable to expeditiously assemble such requirement unless they know where every available item mentioned could be obtained and properly processed for distribution to the various theaters of war. When there is doubt, uncertainty, or delay in the prosecution of this part of the war program it will certainly be reflected in a failure to sustain a regular or increasing momentum by the Army or Navy. Military experts have said time and time again within the last 3 years that the most important factor in a successful drive by an army is sustained and continuous momentum, and that this is impossible without sufficient available supplies of every kind and description for every minute of the hour and every hour of the day. Our military leaders would not dream of making a drive against the enemy without first knowing the available supply of planes, tanks, guns, munitions, men, and so forth, and it is absurd to say or even think they would not necessarily have to have similar information with reference to food and clothing, and I do not know of any agency in the Government that has been definitely authorized by law and charged with the responsibility of ascertaining and providing this information except that provided for in the Bureau of the Census. I know it has been said here that other agencies may be collecting this information already. I am not prepared to admit it, but if they are, certainly somebody has made an appropriation to duplicate the efforts and responsibilities of the Bureau of the Census and, speaking for myself, I would like to know if this is true. If it can be shown that any other such agency is furnishing or is prepared to furnish the information more accurately and more efficiently than the Bureau of the Census, then there would be no justification for continuing this Bureau at all. Others have said we could call on the triple A to gather this information, saying it has organizations and agencies sufficient to secure the information. That may be correct, but they will not be able to do it for nothing and those who advanced the theory have not indicated they would be able to do it any cheaper than the Bureau of the Census. They have also said that the Extension Department could do the same work through county agents. I am not prepared to deny that, but if they undertook it they would certainly have to have more men, more women, and more money, and nobody has undertaken to say that it could be done through that department or agency any cheaper than through the Bureau of the Census. I yield to no man present a greater desire to economize on these activities, and I

am glad to place my record for economy against that of any other Member, but I am definitely convinced that the information gathered would or should contribute to increased efficiency in the prosecution of our war program, and from my observation and experience I believe it can be done with less money by the Bureau of the Census than by any other agency of the Government, and I am therefore supporting this resolution. I am satisfied from the information furnished that our armed forces have been reasonably well supplied with food and clothing, although there have been complaints from individual sections.

I do not know why there should be a scarcity at any place. I am quite sure it is not because the Congress has refused or failed to make the necessary appropriations and if it has been due to the failure of those in charge of securing and distributing food supplies and if their failure has been due to the lack of available information as to where food supplies are available and the program of prosecuting the war has been delayed by reason of such failure, I am prepared to discharge what I consider my responsibility to soldiers on the front lines by providing this information. I know that \$7,000,000 is a pretty large sum of money to ask the taxpayers for, but it represents only one-tenth of the 1 percent of the money refunded to the large taxpayers of the country in 1943 and the burden transferred to men and women with low incomes and I want to emphasize the fact that it was done largely by those who are now howling economy at the expense of our war effort. I may be mistaken in my position, but I have no apologies to offer in my effort to use every legitimate and available means to see that our men in the armed forces are supplied with the necessary food requirements because I would not be able to look one in the face upon his return and have him say that he and his comrades could have saved thousands or hundreds of thousands of lives by terminating the war earlier if they had been promptly and regularly furnished at all times with an ample supply of food and clothing so essential in winning this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes also to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rather regret that the question of politics on this issue has been raised. I am opposed to this appropriation on the ground that it is unnecessary. It is a waste of money and a burden on the taxpayers. I do not attribute to the Republicans a greater interest in economy than that possessed by the Democrats, and I do not like for my Democratic associates to bring up the question of politics. I trust that they will in this case, show their real interest in economy. Let us decide

this thing on the question of what is right and what is wrong. We hear a great deal these days about the strengthening of Congress. We have appointed committees to study problems of its reorganization.

Some are submitting reports on wasteful spending. I agree that those studies should be made. But all this, gentlemen, will be of no avail, unless Congress rededicates itself to the policy of strict economy and dares to confine the activities of the Federal Government to absolutely essential work demanding that Government agencies spend wisely and carefully and spend only such money as will do the job. We cannot, Mr. Chairman, much longer ignore the mounting colossal public debt. We have to be liberal as to war expenditures but we should determine now that every other type of spending will be authorized only if we cannot carry on without it, and then only for the minimum amount which will do the job properly. It is hardly necessary to state that our public debt is a burden that can only be carried and paid by the American people through self-denial, suffering, and labor for years to come. We can make the future burden lighter if we save now where we can. After the war is over; and, of course, gentlemen, that day will come; and the stimulus of the war is no longer in the hearts of the American people, they will face the stern reality that a large part of their possessions and their energies and their would-be savings must be given to our Government to pay the public debt. They will say to us, "Why did you not save a dollar wherever you could? Although you thought you were getting gifts for us, in all truth you were loading us and our children with debt caused by lavish and unnecessary expenditures."

Our nonwar spending has gone up as well as war spending. We are spending today billions of dollars more on nonwar activities than we did before the war, and for years before it. In all frankness, Mr. Chairman, the reason I am opposing this appropriation is that it is in the class of nonessential spending and an inexcusable waste of Government funds. Mr. Chairman, how long will we permit this sort of thing to go on in Congress?

Let us look at this bill. This authorization to take the 5-year census no doubt was good when it was first made because we then had no other agency taking the census. We had nothing else of the same kind, and we needed that kind of information. We passed a law back in 1924, or thereabouts, and we started the first census in 1925. We only authorized three things to be done. The law says we shall take the acreage of farm land; second, the acreage of the principal crop; and, third, the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. Mr. Chairman, that is all the authority we have. We did take the census in 1925, 1930, 1935, and 1940. But, Mr. Chairman, a war came on. After the last war was over I was sent to a school to study first aid at the front. That was after the war was over. Somebody had for-

gotten to countermand the order and the school went on. It was to teach first aid at the front. The need for the school was over, yet the school went on. It is very much like that now, Mr. Chairman.

This census was not stopped by any committee in the House, because no one in the House has given much attention to it. We have other agencies that are doing the same thing right now. We do not direct how the census shall be taken, and yet with this effort, always to build up a Government bureau, they have set up their plan how to do it, and they want hundreds of supervisors and 27,000 enumerators going out over the country to take it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I will yield after I have finished. I really do not have time now. They want 27,000 enumerators. Where are they coming from? They are coming off the farms. That is the testimony. Most of them will come off the farms, 27,000 people, yet we have heard about the shortage of farm labor.

In addition every one of them will have to travel in his automobile over every county in the United States, and cover every farm in the United States; certainly a waste of gasoline and of manpower. And all of it to do what? To find out how many acres, what the crops are, and how many cattle there are.

If you will go into your county you will find where the county agent has a list of every farm and he has a map and it shows every head of cattle on it and every crop. Now, when are we going to stop this foolish spending?

In addition to this amount of \$15,000,000 for the census, we have furnished to the War Manpower Commission, to the War Food Administration, to the O. P. A., and others, millions of dollars to get this same type of information. It has been necessary for this administration to regulate the diet and the food of every family in America; to say when they could eat meat and when they could not. It makes me think there is not much to stabilization, to O. P. A. prices, and all that has gone on to make the food go around. Can we have any confidence in the War Food Administration if their information is no good? Will sending 27,000 people around over the country give us the information so that we can correct this program? I say as a member of the Democratic Party I feel very badly to think the Democrats will stand here and say that our information is no good and that our rationing program is based on a lot of hooey. I do not believe it. I know we have given millions of dollars to these people to find out how many farms there are, what their crops were, and how many cattle they have on their farms today.

On the question of money and saving money, the total amount required for this is something over \$15,000,000. That is the total of what they have had and what they are asking in this bill, \$6,784,000. That is a total of \$15,000,000. I do not care what others may say, the testimony is that they have obligated only about \$2,000,000 to date. They have possible other obligations

that they do not know of accurately, but not in excess of \$2,000,000 more. So, of the \$15,000,000 the total obligation, even after paying the supervisors, those who are on the rolls now, and taking care of these undetermined obligations it leaves from \$11,000,000 to \$13,000,000 that has not yet been spent.

Now, if we stop this at this time we definitely stop what they ask for in this bill, \$6,784,000. If we stop this census it will save a total of from \$11,000,000 to \$13,000,000. If we defeat this bill, they can, with the money that they now have available by previous appropriation take a census, and probably a better one under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I will now take 2 additional minutes.

If they would stop all of it we would save from \$11,000,000 to \$13,000,000. If they go on with it, by such funds as they now have, we certainly can save \$6,784,000.

Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat, I see no reason for either side to consider this a political matter. It is good common sense, ordinary simple business to try to save our taxpayers a little of the burden they face for the next 20 or 40 years.

Not only on this bill but on every item that comes before us we are going to have to rededicate ourselves to making an effort to save a dollar wherever we can save it. To stop this appropriation will do no harm, because we are spending millions to get the same information. I trust that on both sides of the aisle Members will consider that we have a burden to face in the future which demands that we now exercise our self-control, and cease to think of appropriations bringing services to our districts. Vote against this appropriation. Nobody will be hurt and we will have started in the right direction toward practical economy which, in my opinion, is practical patriotism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as a farmer myself I want to discuss the proposed farm census. The futility of the thing is evident on all sides. During December past the time had come for us in our township to put on the regular tuberculosis test of our cattle as well as the Bangs disease test. This was definitely in the public interest in that it had to do with the safeguarding of public health through protecting the milk, and it had to do with the welfare of our livestock. That was handled by a local committee of which I was chairman. It was absolutely impossible to get anyone in the township—and every farmer was involved—to provide a car and a driver to drive the veterinary over the township. No one felt at liberty to take the necessary time, or had the necessary gasoline or good tires for the job. We had to go outside of the township to find one. We finally found a woman in an adjoining

town. This difficulty is going to be universal. We have all the information right now we need to know about these things. It will serve no useful purpose. The information we have is sufficient. The War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, declares there is a scarcity of food of all kinds. That is all we need to know to realize that we have got to step up production on all the farms in all classes of products from one end of this land to the other.

What good purpose would it serve to go out and count the apple trees right here in the Virginias and southern Pennsylvania, one of the heaviest apple producing areas in the Nation when we know that there has recently been shipped, right into these areas, a million and one-half bushels of apples from Canada? That is all the evidence I would need to know that every effort should be made to produce more apples right here.

They tell me this is going to take around 30,000 enumerators. This means 30,000 automobiles with a driver burning gas and using tires. I took the census, myself, back in the twenties. If a census enumerator contacts 8 farms a day he has done a pretty good job. That means 30,000 men taking the census occupying the time of 30,000 other men every day it is in operation. That is just 60,000 man-hours a day as long as it lasts, 60,000 man-hours lost to production. I do not know what the reaction of the farmer will be when the census enumerators take up his time or what the reaction of the census enumerator will be when he tries to contact the farmer two or three times and then finds he cannot get the information he wants. The census enumerators may not get all the information they want and they may find that the farmer has other more important things to do in the war interest.

Calling this matter up again at this time just shows the determination on the part of the administration—and it is typical—to not let one thing go by that may mean votes whether it interferes with winning the war or not, or whether it would save money. So long as it will get a few votes they have got to put it through.

I have received some letters from people in rural districts where they do some earnest thinking about this thing, as to how this is going to react upon these people in this time of war and when the public debt is rising so rapidly; and I just wonder whether your enumerators will be welcome. I am just wondering whether in the public interest and whether to satisfy your own sense of obligation to the people you had not better vote against this worthless expenditure of money. Marvin Jones and the rest of the men who know about food and those who ration food admit there is a scarcity of it.

These people who will go out and spend this time and take up the farmer's time in gathering this information should be doing something in the war effort during this time. Every rural mail carrier puts into the mail box of every farmer every month a card for him to return. The farmers are returning nearly all of them. He has to tell how

much livestock he has, how many he sold last month, how many calves were born, how many lambs, how many sows were bred, how many chickens he ate, the number of eggs he produced, and so forth and so forth. They are continually gathering all this information and it does not serve any useful purpose for a census at this time. It is a vote-getting, money-spending scheme that will interfere with the successful winning of the war and this bill should therefore be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania makes a very strong case for his concluding statement that the taking of this agricultural census is a money-spending, vote-getting scheme. The history of it shows that this originated in a Republican Congress in 1925 and it was provided then that this agricultural census shall be taken every 5 years. The questions being asked today are 300 fewer than were asked in the first census. I do not think you can make a case for saying this is another New Deal extravagance because it was not an idea of the New Deal at all. It was an organic, basic law that was passed and I think it was a wise law.

Now, with reference to the need for this, I do not know how badly it is needed and I do not believe any man on the floor of this House is as well qualified to say how badly it is needed as is the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the War Food Administration. They both have made very strong statements in favor of the taking of an agricultural census at this time.

We have heard here time and again very impressive statements that the impact of this war upon agriculture has had a devastating effect, that the whole success of the war is threatened by a break-down of agricultural production because of the manpower situation. Another thing we have been hearing is that although there has been a congressional statement of agriculture being an essential industry and that selective-service boards should defer young men on the farms within certain categories, yet time and again that is not being done, that the farms are being denuded, they do not have the labor, they do not have the machinery, they do not have the equipment, they are being starved of everything that they need to carry on. Very shortly we are going to be called on to consider agriculture in the post-war era. Then you will want to know what happened to agriculture. What did it do? How many of the farms had to shut down because of no labor, how many of them did not have sufficient farm machinery? And a thousand other pertinent questions that I do not believe any agency of the Government has at the present time.

The gentleman from Illinois and my dearly beloved friend from Kentucky have stated that other agencies in the

Government are getting this information and why should they not do it?

I know both of those gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations so well that I know if any other agency of the Government for which we had appropriated funds to do a specific job would start out taking an agricultural census, my two friends would very properly and immediately be on their feet saying, "We did not appropriate this money for you to take this census; not only that, but the law says that the Census Bureau should take it."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. How can the War Food Administration tell us how much food each individual should have if they do not know the number of cattle or the amount of crops on the farms?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think the War Food Administration has accurate, last-minute, up-to-date information on that at the present time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Are they guessing at it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think some of it has been a guess. Some has been based on partial reports.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is a terrible indictment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They can answer for themselves, but they say they do not have that information. If the information is needed, \$14,000,000 is not a great sum of money to spend if it is really going to help agriculture. In the time that I have in this House I have opened up the Public Treasury, as the rest of you have, and have poured out literally millions and millions of dollars in an effort to try to help agriculture.

Let us just go a step further. Are we not in this sort of a situation? It is just like the fellow who starts out to build a house. He draws his plans. He makes his contract. He gets the house half completed, and then he sits down and says, "Well, I believe I was a fool to build this house; not only that, but I am not building the right kind of a house." Which way would I be the biggest fool? To let the half-built house stand there as a monument to my lack of intelligence and foresight, or to try to finish the job?

We started out on this agricultural census the very way that it has always been conducted, the very same machinery, the very same procedure, the very same technique, and the very same set of questions, except in a few instances. Money was appropriated to take it, and the question came up whether the enumerators should be appointed before or after the election. Very properly we waited to appoint them until after the election, because it should not get mixed up in an election. The further question came up as to what time of the year the census should be taken, and very properly we provided that it be taken at a time of the year when the farmer would be less busy and less engaged.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have passed the point of talking about whether or not we ought to take the census. We have an investment of any-

where from two and a half to four or five million dollars in this census. The machinery has been set up under the Director of the Census under our mandate. He has appointed supervisors. He has established quarters. He has had forms printed, and in many instances has engaged enumerators.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who said this was a vote-getting scheme, recalls that we have provided that these enumerators and supervisors would not be appointed until after January 1. If it had been a vote-getting scheme, we might well have done it before election, but the Republicans at that time thought they would carry the House, so they wanted it put over until after January 1.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman that it was on the 23d of June that I, as a Member of the Congress, made the point of order at that time preventing this census being taken before January 1. I have no political interest in it personally, because to me it should not be undertaken at this time. We get much more information today than any census will ever give on information that is necessary for the war. I would not apply that to general information, but so far as the war is concerned, the War Food Administration and the Crop Reporting Service are giving us more information every month than this census will ever give.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I say to the gentleman that the War Food Administration and the Crop Reporting Service are giving us such information as they get and such information as they have. It is based on reports. But they tell us that they need a census now to bring the thing up to date and to tie it up with present conditions.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, down in my district people are struggling under a crushing weight of taxation. I know it has been recently said that there is nothing in the statement of John Marshall that the power to tax is the power to destroy, but people who are being shorn and skinned by taxation down where I live are tired of this continual spending of money that we do not have for things we do not need and can do without.

I own and operate a farm. I grow cattle, hogs, and sheep for sale. If I thought this count of the farm animals of the country and the individuals on the farm would add one runt pig to one litter of pigs or make a twin out of a single bull calf anywhere in this country, there might be some excuse for this needless expenditure of money.

What is the practical result of it? A man is out on the farm at work, and a census enumerator, who ought to be at work, takes a farmer from between the plow handles or away from some other task and asks him how many cattle and

how many hogs and how many sheep there are on that farm, and undertakes to find out how much corn and wheat and oats were raised last year.

I think we will all agree that there are agencies that have a reasonable idea of what the food resources of the country are today, what they have on the farms, and what was produced last year, and what will likely be produced next year.

What will this cost? Six million seven hundred and eighty-four thousand dollars. We have gotten to the point now that a dollar in this country is looked upon as chaff which the wind bloweth away. Let us translate this sum into farm animals. This sum that it is proposed to appropriate for this needless expenditure represents 67,840 steers at \$100 apiece, or 678,400 lambs at \$10 apiece.

It is said we ought to vote for it, or at least we are estopped from voting against it, because some 20 years ago a Republican Congress authorized a farm census. That was in peacetime and this is in wartime. That was when we were not broke and this is at a time when we approach that period in our fiscal history when the debt of this country will be equivalent to every dollar's worth of property in it.

People get up here and talk about economy and then honor the economy to which they render lip service more in the breach than in the observance, because every time they get a chance to spend millions of the people's money they vote it out of the taxpayer's pocket to some bureaucrat. This expenditure of \$6,784,000 will not increase production.

I can give you one suggestion as to how we can help the farmer: Stop stripping the farms of farm labor. You cannot take a boy from town and make a farm hand out of him overnight. He just does not know how to do farm work.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, this would make Government officials out of some 27,000 farmers.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes. Fellows who ought to be at work, ought to be tilling the soil, and ought to be engaged in the work of producing a crop which we badly need. We need food now.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would not this be the result, that these fellows would have a draft classification which would prevent them either from going to war or going into essential industry?

Mr. JENNINGS. They would be deferred from the armed services, or in the event this work-or-jail bill becomes a law, from being put into some useful form of employment.

The very unusual argument was made here a moment ago by my astute friend from Georgia that you ought to vote for this bill, because the Republicans are against it. We Republicans are opposed to wasting the people's money.

I am glad to stand here in favor of economy and to vote against this waste of this large sum of money.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that the various A. A. A. committees throughout the Nation have in their possession information to a large degree identical with that sought in an agricultural census. I cannot see why the Bureau of the Census does not utilize this established set-up to secure the answers to the numerous questions contained in the enumerators' workbook we have exhibited here today.

On page 24 of the hearings you will note that we have a total of 9,093 county committeemen and 104,700 township committeemen, all bona fide farmers and all having a good knowledge of the general conditions on the farms of their neighbors. For years this great organization, which I have always supported personally, has accumulated vast information relative to acreage, crops produced, and like problems.

Here, in this resolution, we are being asked for \$6,784,000 for the purpose of taking an agricultural census, in addition to nearly \$8,000,000 appropriated last year for the same job. Let us remember first that the previous Census of this nature cost only about \$9,000,000 and ask ourselves the question, "Why, in time of war, should it be necessary to spend \$15,000,000 to do that same job?"

We can also well ask ourselves, Can we justify the usage of 28,000 people at this time for 2 or 3 months in work that could well be done after the war has been won and there is need to furnish jobs for returning servicemen?

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the bill as drawn, or one very similar to it, will be passed by the House, as the majority in control have decreed its passage. May I express the hope that some compromise may be effected and thereby save the taxpayers of America millions of dollars and still get a satisfactory job done?

Millions of dollars can be saved, Members of this House, if the Bureau of the Census will only work through our great A. A. A. organizations to secure this information needed. Why cannot our county A. A. A. committeemen mail out to the farmers in each county these blanks and request each farmer to take a few hours in the evening to fill these out and return to the county committee? The various township committeemen could call personally on the very small percentage of farmers who would not forward in such blank, properly filled out, and aid them, their close neighbors to do so.

Can you see any good reason why millions of dollars could not be saved by this method rather than to have 28,000 enumerators scurrying around in their cars from farm to farm, bothering the farmers at their work, using gasoline and precious tires? I know the \$8 or \$10 per day these enumerators would earn looks very attractive to many. To these men and women, however, I would say that the saving of four or five millions of dollars to the taxpayers should also be an incentive.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think this entire project should be put off until the war is over. However, also frankly speaking, it is evident that only a middle-of-the-road compromise has any chance whatever of being agreed to by the majority of the Members of this House.

With that in mind, I am intending to offer an amendment to the bill at the proper time to reduce this appropriation by several millions of dollars. It is my sincere belief that if the Bureau of the Census will cooperate with the A. A. A. and will also eliminate the items in its questionnaire which can serve no good purpose in the winning of the war, that this census job can be done very quickly and accurately. The farmers of America are ready to do their part in this and we need not pay an average of \$1.02 for each return to an enumerator who could better be doing something worth while in producing food. We on the farm will be glad to fill out these blanks and mail them in. It is not necessary for any man or woman to waste gasoline and tires coming to the farms, 6,000,000 of these farms by the way.

Our rural carriers will bring the blanks to the farms and take them away again after a few days when the farmer has had the opportunity in the evening to check into his records and answer the questions as well as he can.

Two additional girls in each county committee office, or about 6,000 in the Nation, can well do the work, and do it better, than can 28,000 men and women trying to travel the snow-filled roads of February and March, wasting gasoline, tires, money, and taking up the time of farmers who today are so short-handed in labor that they are fast becoming dependent as to their ability to produce the food which must be produced.

I hope that the House will see fit to accept my amendment to the bill. It is a compromise, it will get this job done, yet will save manpower and millions of dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I open my remarks today with the old saying "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

In 1940 the Republican platform read:

The Republican Party will put into effect such governmental policies, temporary and permanent, as will establish and maintain an equitable balance between labor, industry, and agriculture.

Those words are the official pledge to the Nation by the Republican Party.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] who just left the floor—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7347 September 23, 1942—said in this House:

Did you ever stop to think that food is just as necessary to the winning of this war as is almost anything, except manpower, that you can mention, tanks, guns, planes, or munitions? Have you momentarily paused and thought of what may come to our beloved Nation in a few years time if too much farm labor is stripped from the farms, if experienced farmers continue to be taken in the draft. * * * We have plenty of food today. How about tomorrow?

H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think that was a very good prophecy, was it not?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, I do not know. We still have food.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] said:

When famine strikes home next winter—

He was speaking in June 1943—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6225—all this bugaboo went on to frighten the public and the Congress into a shivering fear, "You are going to have a famine." That is what they told us back in 1943. We have got something of the same problem hovering over this House again this afternoon. This is what he said:

When famine strikes home next winter in New York City and other large consuming areas. * * * It will then be a question of getting food at any price, if it can be secured at all. Within 6 months most legitimate food dealers will be out of business because of inability to secure supplies from food processors. * * * There is a question in my mind if they will be able to get enough supplies to take care of the requirements of our armed forces, to say nothing of lend-lease commitments.

Do you remember that quotation in the House?

Our dear friend, my personal friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] on October 6, 1943—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page 3592—spoke across the aisle and stated:

I urge an immediate survey, to be completed by January 1, a kind of census of all the time-saving machinery on United States farms.

My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on February 24, 1943—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1270—rose in this House as he does with all his vigor and vim and said:

Now, on machinery, why can there not be made a recheck on the inventories on machinery * * * in the hope that there can be an increase in the quotas on various types of machines that are necessary to till the soil?

Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said again on February 24, 1943—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1263:

I think it is eminently fair to conclude that there has been no comprehensive food program, and that the Department of Agriculture and other officials charged with this responsibility have not been seeing in the future and determining the needs of his country.

And now to recall further statements made in the Congress on subjects intimate to the agricultural census, I quote the following extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Accurate information and figures are a critical necessity. At present figures put out by the Government are notoriously inaccurate (THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, Ohio, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, p. 2752, 78th Cong., 1st sess., June 2, 1943, from his address Food Is Our Most Serious Problem.)

Mr. Speaker, the whole problem of farm production and the need of food supply should be examined realistically and practically, and that right now all factors and all matters should be worked out so there may be a better understanding on this extremely important problem. (EDWARD H. REES, Republican, Kansas, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8375, Oct. 19, 1942.)

Mr. Speaker, I think that all Members of the House will agree with the distinguished

chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that the Congress should do everything in its power to prevent the dilemma, indeed the catastrophe, that faced agriculture following the last war. (DEWEY SHORT, Republican, Missouri, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9748, Dec. 16, 1944.)

Food production is not a day-by-day process. It requires advance planning. (RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, Republican, Indiana, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2202, Mar. 18, 1943.)

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] cites many statistics relating to farm incomes, production, values, and so forth—statistics available from the Census Bureau.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] thanks him for the wealth of information and pays his respects for giving so much careful study to the farm problem.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] replies:

I thank the gentleman for that, but so far as I am concerned I cannot take any personal credit for it, because the information is all down in these departments, and has been there, and this great committee that is here today is the one who has been granting appropriations to produce that information year after year. The only credit that I can take, is that I have had enough interest to get the facts, because as Members know, when we have the facts, it is easy to know how to vote. (REID F. MURRAY, Republican, Wisconsin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD APPENDIX, p. A717, Feb. 8, 1944.)

The farmers of America must be provided with sufficient farm machinery and parts for repair if they are to produce the foods so badly needed for our fighting forces. * * * It is the responsibility of Congress to do everything possible to assist agriculture. (A. L. MILLER, Republican, Nebraska, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 614, Feb. 4, 1943.)

So, Mr. Chairman, today we are asked to look into the future to find out what is necessary, what farm needs really are, what shortages and what surpluses exist, so industry will be able to prepare to supply its necessities immediately in the post-war program for the betterment and comfort of those who have struggled along with inferior implements as well as to eliminate the antiques of drudgery for the veteran upon his return. Yet, Mr. Chairman, when in an orderly fashion we seek to take these steps we are confronted with the accusation, "politics."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I believe the last speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, really gave us more to think about than some of us realize. I believe many of us are familiar with agriculture. I have been astonished to notice how those who are so anxious to have this census, with one or two exceptions, all come from States that do not produce enough food to even feed themselves. I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] brought out the real purpose of this census. Anyone who is familiar with the

situation knows that our Bureau of Agricultural Economics and our Agricultural Adjustment Administration have more information on agriculture than this census will ever develop. By the time the information obtained from this census is available it will be entirely obsolete as far as its contribution to the war is concerned. Anyone familiar with agriculture at the present time knows that all these Government agencies have information at the end of every month telling exactly the number of pounds of milk produced in every State in the Union, the number of eggs and other agricultural products that are produced in this country every month. That is a set-up that has developed since 1925.

I do say this, that I believe the business interests, as our good friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] said, are the ones who are interested in this bill. I believe what they want to know is how many millions or billions of dollars the farmer has accumulated in this time when he has been pictured as rolling in so much unaccustomed wealth. I think they want to know just exactly how much wool has been grown so they can get out their shears to clip it as soon as the war is over. I do not believe there is any doubt as to that or as to the fact that from the businessman's standpoint there is some merit to it. But as far as agricultural information is concerned there is not a living soul who can stand on this floor and say that we are justified at this time in spending these great amounts of money for information that does not help win this war; and no man yet has told us where this information is going to help win this war in any way. As a matter of fact it is going to keep us from winning the war by just the extent it ties up manpower, uses gas, and consumes tires. If the bill cannot be defeated and the item eliminated entirely, I sincerely hope the amount can be cut down. The first census cost \$4,000,000 plus. That was in 1925. In 1935 the cost was five million and some thousands. Why all at once during wartime, does it blossom out to a \$15,000,000 figure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the gentleman's permission may I not say to my very distinguished friend from Michigan that he reminds me of the fellow who was marshaled to speak for the character of the accused and said he is a good eater. There was just about as much germaneness to the things he said as there was in the illustration I gave. The fact of the matter is that all this information is available through the War Food Administration and there are literally thousands of people down here available for assembling that information. In addition thereto the War Production Board and the other instrumentalities of the Government have acquired that information once and they do not have to acquire it a second time.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I should like to remind the gentleman from Illinois that he ought to be very discreet in his praise of anything that has been done because he might be praising something that happened under the Democratic administration.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan whether he is addressing me or the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Illinois just made a reference to me and I replied. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I make no excuse for saying that this is interesting to industry.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. And I do not believe the gentleman from Wisconsin wishes to take the position that people in the rural districts are not interested in industry as it affects the farmer whether it be ice-boxes, plows, or machinery. Somebody has to have the facts if you want to properly prepare to take care of the people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would suggest that our friend from Michigan read the statute that was put on the books in 1924 or 1925 which circumscribes the area within which an agricultural census may be taken. It provides specifically for acreage of principal crops, acreage, value and number of livestock. That is what it provides for and all of these other things are extraneous matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois I would say there is no limit put upon what may be inquired about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the gentleman read the language.

Mr. RABAUT. It is right here in the book.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Read it to the Committee. They would like to have it, and it is the best evidence, you know.

Mr. RABAUT. I will insert in today's proceedings section 205, title 13, chapter IV, United States Code, for the gentleman's edification.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The original statute creating the Department of Agriculture, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, gives the Secretary power at his discretion at any time to collect the information provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, there should be no misunderstanding as to the law under which we are presently operating. It is available for anyone's inspection and will be found in section 216 of title XIII of the United States Code.

Let me read it to you now so that the Members will have it today when they perhaps will vote upon the pending resolution.

There shall be in the year 1935 and once every 10 years thereafter a census of agriculture and livestock which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. The schedule employed in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of the first day of January and relate to the crop year.

I am now quoting the exact language from section 216 of title XIII, United States Code.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct—

Mr. KEEFE. I am surprised to have that admission from the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is usually correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I accept the compliment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certain inquiries are specifically designated in the statute but the questions to be asked in the census are not limited to the designated subjects. The statute provides that the schedule of questions employed in the census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census and every Director of the Census and every Secretary of Agriculture under every President since the agricultural census was instituted has held the statute to authorize questions on related subjects supplying data required to give a full picture of the agricultural situation. No Director and no Secretary under any President has ever interpreted any provision of the statute as a limitation. And that interpretation has been approved by every succeeding Congress providing funds for the census.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to ask a question or does he want to make a speech? He has plenty of time to make a speech in his own time. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

Mr. Chairman, I read the statute to the members of the committee, and I am just as able as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri to place an interpretation upon the plain English that appears therein.

May I say that the administrative interpretation that has been put on this statute by the New Deal makes it as broad as the wind, and administratively they contend that under this limited language they can go out and ask any questions under the sun and fail to ask any questions that they do not want to ask that might get them information that the people of this country ought to have.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield to the gentleman from Michigan, because he cannot contribute anything more on this particular question.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield. I am utterly amazed by the argument made by the gentleman from Michigan. I want to talk to you people over on the Democratic side—

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, am I going to be permitted to occupy this floor or not? The gentleman from Michigan knows the rules of this House; and if he does not, he ought to. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor, and he intends to occupy the floor in his own time.

Let us get down to brass tacks on this proposition for just a minute. You say that Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, wants this bill passed. You say that other agencies of government want this bill passed. I have read the hearings before the Deficiency Committee, and the only person who testified was Mr. Capt. Director of the Census. If you had information in the form of letters or something else, you did not submit it for the benefit of the members so that we could read it in the hearings. You did not subject either Marvin Jones or the Secretary of Agriculture to cross-examination. Let me ask you this. When you say that Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, must have the information in this census, are you not making a confession to the people of this country that you will live to regret? Marvin Jones, as War Food Administrator, and the agencies in the Department of Agriculture have been making crop allocations for a number of years. They have been telling the people of this country what to grow and what not to grow. Based upon the same information, the O. P. A. has been placing restrictions upon the diets of the people of this country, limitations upon price and supply, upon the theory that they have available the information as to the amount of food supplies that are available.

I recently wrote to Marvin Jones and said, "Will you please tell me the basis upon which you are making your allocations of milk subsidy payments to the farmers of this country? What is the reason that you are paying 60 cents a hundred to the farmers in Wisconsin and 90 cents a hundred to the farmers in other sections of the country?" You should have seen the maze and mass of information that Marvin Jones came back with and the amount of statistical information that he had available to give me that answer. He could tell me the production of milk in every single county in the United States. He could tell me the number of milch cows in the United States. He could tell every pound of milk produced and where and how it was consumed or processed. He could tell me the number of chickens on every farm and the number of dozen eggs that have been produced on every farm in the United States.

They claim to have that information and they have it currently available, as you all know. Operating in conjunction with the triple A program, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Extension Service, and the crop-reporting agencies of the various States, that information

is not 5 years old. Do you mean to say that Mr. Bowles has issued his orders rationing food and fixing prices on information that is not accurate?

Do you mean to tell me that the W. P. B. when they made their allocations of steel for the manufacture of farm implements and machinery did not know what the available supply of farm machinery was? Are you confessing as Democrats that your whole war program has been based upon misinformation?

I am glad that my friend from Kentucky, a distinguished Democrat, had the courage to stand here in the well of this House and tell you Democrats the truth, but you will not believe it, and why? Because you know that you have the votes to pass this or any other bill. You are going to pass this bill, I am certain of that, because you are going to vote for it en masse. You are going to vote for it as Democrats, you are going to vote for it because you have been told that this is a Democratic matter. Well, you vote for it. All I want to do is let the people of this country know that although my good chairman in his first talk to the members of the Committee on Appropriations impressed upon us the necessity for economy and for refusing to appropriate a single dollar that was not necessary for the war effort, on the very first test in meeting that admonition from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations we are going to vote to squander \$14,500,000 to take a farm census in order to put some 30,000 more on the pay roll and interfere with the prosecution of the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if you have read the hearings you will find the whole long list of telegrams and excerpts from letters. How many of you have read those? How many of you have read these hearings? If you will read the hearings, what will it demonstrate? It will demonstrate, if it demonstrates anything at all, that they are having a terrible job not only to get the supervisory personnel but to get enumerators to do this work. There is letter after letter recorded in which the people who are solicited to become enumerators say they will not take the job for the money that is offered. What is the implication from that. The implication is that they are busy or they have jobs already that will pay them more money than you want to offer them under this census program.

The other thing that shows up in these statements is this: Letter after letter comes in, such as the letter put in from the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], in which it appears that a large number of the people who are doing this job are not Democrats, they are Republicans. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] told the committee that the man in charge in his area is a Republican, a fine man. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] said the man down in his area is a Republican. So it is all over the

country. Republicans are being asked to do this job.

I suppose the only conclusion you can draw from that is there are no more Democrats who might possibly be available to do this job. The reason for this is obvious. You have 3,500,000 of them on the pay roll now and there are no more Democrats to fill these jobs. I do not feel that is exactly the situation, however. But, Members of this Congress, you are going to have a terrible job getting this information. Let me show you something. Let us get down to the real facts of this thing. Here is a newspaper published in my district. What does it say? It says:

Urge farmers prepare data in advance for census takers.

That is a Democratic paper too. What did they do? Why, they could not get census enumerators. They are not able to get the people to go out and take the census.

So what do they do? This article says that the Director is sending this form out in the mail to the farmers and asking them to fill it out and send it back to headquarters. So you are going to have that farmer fill this form out and you are going to get that type of information. What are the farmers going to do? He will get this bulletin from headquarters and supply the information that the census enumerator will finally use in filling out the census return. The farmer will tell how many cows there are on his farm. That may make some difference to him as between the number that are on the farm and what is shown on the assessor's rolls, do you not see? Does anybody check to see how many cows are there? Does anybody check to see how many chickens are there? Does anybody check to find out how many dozen eggs were collected or how many dozen eggs were sold? Does anybody check to see how much milk was sold on that farm? Can anybody check to determine how much food was consumed on the farm? You talk about accurate information. Why, it is ridiculous. It cannot be anything more than the barest kind of an estimate made up of a lot of guesses that have been slapped together to call it a farm census.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, let me say further, you are going to pass this bill. You are going to pass this just as you are going to pass a lot of other bills in this session of Congress. So far as we on the Republican side are concerned, we want to see the issue made clear. You and your spokesman have told the people of this country that you are solidly behind the war; that you intend to devote every dollar of the resources of this country and all its energy to the war effort. Now you are kicking 30,000 people out of their jobs on the farms where they are producing food and you are sending them out on the highways and byways, burning gasoline and using up tires to take the census. You are going to spend \$15,000,000 to do it. When you have the

census, then what have you got? Oh, I know it is easy to hook everything onto the war effort. I listened to the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], who tried to hook this onto the war effort so that the taking of this census would appear to help the boys over on the battle front. Why, Mr. Chairman, this material will not be available for 6 or 8 months. If you read the hearings, Mr. Capt says they perhaps will not conclude the enumeration until June, and it will take another 6 months to compile it. Why, it is perfectly ridiculous to talk about getting information between now and June that will be of assistance in telling the farmers in the northern half of the country what they should plant for crops to remedy food deficiencies in the growing crop year of 1945.

It seems to me it is perfectly absurd. Now, you take the responsibility. You are running this show. Your leadership has brought this bill out here. We licked this bill twice. When they asked for \$5,500,000, it was defeated by a roll-call vote and you told us at that time "Wait until January when our new men get in here and we will pass it." Now, it is January, and you are here with your added strength. You are not asking for \$5,500,000. Now, you are here asking for \$6,784,000. Well, I congratulate you. I congratulate you upon your power. I am telling you right now, my friends on the Democratic side, and most of you are my friends and I have some very dear friends over here that I think the world of, you have got that responsibility. Now you face the people of this country in view of what you said last week, when you said that the manpower situation was so critical that you had to pass a law to conscript labor in this country, to regiment them under a draft. Then you tell the people the very next week, the same leadership, the same control, "We are going to take 30,000 men and put them to work on this silly business of taking a census in wartimes." A census that may have been thoroughly advisable in 1925, or 1930, cannot be justified under conditions as you described them last week when you voted for this manpower conscription bill. I say to you gentlemen, you go ahead and send out the word to the Nation. Oh, yes. You talk about economy. Yes, we do not intend to spend the people's money foolishly. Here you are going to throw away \$14,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on this futile thing. Why not say to the people "We intend to do what we said." Why not send a word of hope and encouragement back to the people of this country that Congress is determined to get behind the war effort, and not to expend a single manpower hour or a single dollar that is not essential and necessary for the prosecution of the war?

I am convinced that no effective showing can be made that the expending of this money will contribute one iota to the war effort. I am further convinced that to utilize critical manpower in this manner would make a mockery of the arguments presented last week in connection with the labor-conscription bill. I am convinced that when the public know the truth of this situation and see the utter recklessness with which public

funds are being thrown about in utter disregard of the necessity of the war effort and the bankrupt condition of the Treasury, they will call to account those who vote for this expenditure.

Some two million dollars of the appropriation has already been spent, and another two million may be necessary to wind up this fiasco. For me, I would rather lose the entire \$4,000,000 than to continue this unnecessary program and squander \$14,684,000 plus such additional sums as may be found necessary before the job is completed. If these were normal times, there might be some reason in the arguments of the proponents of this legislation. The country is at war, and we must give up many things which might otherwise be considered necessary in order that we might carry on most effectively with the war effort. My conscience will not permit me to vote to squander public funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] quoted from chapter IV, title 13, section 216. In order to put the other wheel on his cart, and give the whole story to the Congress so it will keep him in proper seat, I ask at this point to put section 205 in the RECORD.

Section 205. Duties of supervisors, enumerators, and other employees:

Each supervisor shall perform such duties as may be imposed upon him by the Director of the Census in the enforcement of this chapter, and the duties thus imposed shall be performed in any and all particulars in accordance with the orders and instructions of the Director of the Census; that each enumerator or other employee detailed to serve as enumerator shall be charged with the collection in his subdivision of the facts and statistics called for on the population and agricultural schedules, and such other schedules as the Director of the Census may determine shall be used by him in connection with the census. It shall be the duty of each enumerator to visit personally each dwelling house in his subdivision, and each family therein, and each individual living out of a family in any place of abode, and by inquiry made of the head of each family, or of the member thereof deemed most competent and trustworthy, or of such individual living out of a family, to obtain each and every item of information and all particulars required for the census; and in case no person shall be found at the usual place of abode of such family, or individual living out of a family, competent to answer the inquiries, then it shall be lawful for the census employee to obtain the required information as nearly as may be practicable from the family or families or person or persons living nearest to such place of abode who may be competent to answer such inquiries (June 18, 1929, ch. 28, sec. 5, 46 Stat. 22).

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, of course that request must be made in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is to place a certain section of the law pertaining to this bill in the RECORD?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be required to renew that request in the House.

Mr. RABAUT. I will make the request in the House, Mr. Chairman.

(Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just preceded me, my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for whom I have great respect, has challenged the Democratic Party to pass this bill. I am sorry this has resolved itself into a political matter, but as far as I am concerned, and I think as far as every other Democratic Member in this House is concerned, we are willing to accept the challenge and pass this bill when we get an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, I have been taught all my life to respect the law of this country. Maybe my training has been peculiar in that respect, but in 1925 and 1930, the Republican Party in the Congress that was then functioning in this Nation, spent \$14,000,000 to take this very kind of census we are now discussing.

To show you how valuable it was, the first census was compiled in two octavo volumes and is available now for the people of this country and will always be available for them to go to and see what were the needs of the farmer and what were the needs of the business life of this Nation at that time. When the second census was taken 5 years after and that by the Republican Party, it comprised 11 volumes of valuable information with respect to the farm life of this country and also the industrial life of this country as was ever collected. It is now available and will be as long as this Nation stands.

This is the law of the land. Men whom we can depend upon have come before our committees and come from the various divisions of this Government and told us that this census was necessary. As far as I am concerned I am willing to take the advice of these men. I live in a great farming area and know something about the farm industry of this country of ours.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield briefly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What right has this body here today, unless we repeal that law, to take action in violation of the specific terms of that act which states that we shall do this thing?

Mr. KERR. It is wrong; the gentleman knows it and every other man in this House knows it. This is a sacred law of this land and it involves the right of 30,000,000 farmers in this country who are as valuable citizens as we have and who will always contribute much to the welfare of this country and to its history. This census involves knowledge obtained from them and is most important to the industry of this country.

Yes; if the Republican Party wants to make a political issue of this matter, if they want to challenge the Democrats to pass this measure, I insist. Let us accept the challenge and pass it and abide by the law and confirm the law and make the law useful as the men who wrote it and as the men who know some-

thing about it demand that it should be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time and the remainder of all time for general debate to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee has just indicated, we now come to the close of general debate on this bill. I shall not attempt to answer all the charges that have been made but I shall mention a few statements or charges that have been repeatedly made by all of those, if I remember correctly, who have opposed the bill.

Charge No. 1 is that the A. A. A. can do this job. Is it not quite significant that so many laudatory remarks should come here today about the A. A. A. from the Republican side of this House? I am glad these gentlemen have finally decided that the A. A. A. after all is such an efficient organization. Some of us did not fully realize how efficient it was until I heard these laudatory speeches today. The reply, however, again is that if the A. A. A. had this information certainly it has not passed it on to the Secretary of Agriculture, because despite what the gentleman from Wisconsin, my esteemed friend, has said, let me once again remind the House that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for this information and urged the passage of the pending bill.

The fact that the War Food Administrator, Mr. Marvin Jones, has written a letter in which he has asked specifically for the information, is the best answer to the argument that he now has all that information. Much has been said about the information on which the Food Administrator has made his decisions and issued directives. For many years I have had a high regard for Marvin Jones, the Food Administrator. Now to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] say the Food Administrator knows the number of cows and chickens owned by every farmer in America is certainly a high compliment to him. Of course no one pretends to say that the War Food Administrator or the Department of Agriculture knows every calf, every chicken, every duck on every farm in the country. But no doubt they can make and have made reasonable accurate estimates. The Food Administrator says he wants the full facts and if ever a time we should have the facts rather than an estimate it is now. Charge No. 2 is that the passage of this bill proposes a waste of manpower. You have heard that over and over again. Somebody said there will be 27,000 farmers taken out of production to do this work. Yet, let me again remind you the record discloses that every enumerator must be cleared through the United States Employment Service, so that oft-repeated charge, like the rest falls by the wayside. The record also discloses that for the most part the actual enumeration is being made by elderly farm women. A few disabled

war veterans and older men have been employed.

Again they say the agricultural census is not needed. Oh, it was greatly needed back in 1925 and again in 1930. A Republican Secretary of Agriculture appointed by the great engineer testified it was needed. But now with America in a war that will decide civilization for centuries to come and with the growing realization that the slogan "food will win the war" is becoming more and more important, we are suddenly told that this vital information the Food Administrator and Secretary of Agriculture both say is essential is not actually needed.

The gentleman from Illinois, the very eloquent orator and clever debater, Mr. DIRKSEN, departed somewhat from the usual opposition. You will remember he did not say that this census is unnecessary, and I challenge the RECORD on that score. Oh, he said there were a lot of foolish questions being asked in these schedules by the Census Bureau. I hold in my hand these books they talk about containing all of the questions. They say there are some foolish questions in here. That may be true. He read some of those questions into the RECORD. There were originally many more questions when his party took the census. I have here a list of the new questions being asked this year. These were not asked by our Republican brethren. There are only six of them in this book and none are among those placed in this RECORD by the gentleman from Illinois. Three hundred and eight questions asked back under "Hoover, hell, and hard times" have been eliminated. Ninety-five questions have been eliminated in the other book I hold here. The six new questions are important and sensible. They refer mostly to the dairying industry, milking machines, poultry, eggs, and electric power being used on the various farms. Does anyone object to that information? Does anyone say that information would not be helpful not only in winning the war, but also in the post-war program to follow? If petty partisan politics is not the primary factor behind this stubborn Republican opposition, then I must confess, I am at a loss to know what is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the amount named in the appropriation contained in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, for preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quinquennial Census of Agriculture of the United States is hereby increased by \$6,784,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURPHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. J. Res. 85) making an addi-

tional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the course of debate today and include certain data referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include certain extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post by Drew Pearson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think consideration of this bill should be postponed until we vote on the bill now before the House. I do not think you ought to come in here at this time of the day, with all the pressure that has been put on the Members of the House, and attempt to bring that measure up when we are right on the verge of voting on a bill that has been debated all day long. I hope the gentleman will withdraw it, because I cannot agree to its consideration at this time. I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF WAR VETERANS SUFFERING FROM NERVOUS AND MENTAL DISORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two columns by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House today what I believe to be one of our most pressing problems.

Simply and broadly stated it is this: The treatment and rehabilitation of war veterans who are suffering from nervous and mental disorders.

An immediate concern of the Congress, as I view it, is to find a way for specialized training of from 10,000 to 20,000 medical graduates in the field of neuro-

psychiatric treatment, and to provide reasonable assurances that an adequate number of men so trained shall go into veterans' hospitals for a definite and specified length of time.

I do not propose today to attempt to give all the answers to this very broad subject. I shall introduce some legislation a little later on dealing with a proposed training program and some other phases of the problem.

The Congress has taken some very commendable steps to provide for rehabilitation and readjustment of veterans in the G. I. bill of rights. That is a broad charter providing many avenues for physical, financial, and educational readjustments. That bill, along with other legislation, provides for hospitalization in a rather liberal way, as it should. But neither the Veterans Administration nor any other agency of Government today is able to cope with this growing problem of the psychiatric case.

A competently trained and skilled psychiatrist cannot be made overnight. A graduate of a reputable medical school who has the natural aptitude for special work with nerve or mental cases usually must spend from 3 to 5 years beyond an internship before he is considered adequately trained for treatment of such cases.

A great majority of those properly trained today are now in the armed forces. There are less than 4,000 members of American Psychiatric Association, all told. No one desires to take any of these men from the armed forces, where they are unquestionably needed badly.

But so far as I know there is at this time no plan or proposal that would give any degree of assurance that the services of any appreciable number of these psychiatrists now serving in the Army and Navy Medical Corps might be retained for veterans' hospitals when the war is over. Many of them, no doubt will desire to return to private practice. For, mind you, the impact of war has created many neuropsychiatric cases in the civilian population, and many veterans will be discharged without being hospitalized no doubt, who will be suffering from some nervous or mental disorder.

Already there have been discharged from the armed services between 130,000 and 140,000 men because of neurotic maladjustments. There will be many more, and still others will develop when those who appear normal at the time of their discharge, return to civilian life.

These men will be scattered in communities all across the country. And let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that in the end, regardless of what Congress or Government may do, much of the success of rehabilitating these men will depend upon how conscious the community becomes of its responsibility and of how successfully it meets and discharges that responsibility.

It is encouraging in this respect to note that many communities and States are showing an active interest in this matter. And in this connection I call the attention of the House to a series of columns written recently by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes. I regard him as one of the

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section

79th-1st, No.23

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued February 8, 1945, for actions of Wednesday, February 7, 1945)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

A.A.A. allotments.....1	Housing.....7	Public works.....7
Appropriations.....2,3,7	Independent offices appro-	Purchasing.....9
Census of agriculture....2	priation bill.....3	Reclamation.....7
Commodity Credit.....5	Labor, farm.....6,17	Research.....18
Executive authority.....24	Lend-lease.....15	Rubber.....25
Foreign relief.....19	Loan agencies.....4	Small business.....20
Forestry.....18	National service.....21,23	Taxation.....22
Government corporations.14	Personnel.....13	Transportation.....11
Grazing.....7	Post-war planning.....25	Vehicles.....8
Health.....12	Property acquisition....10	Veterans.....16

HOUSE

1. A.A.A. ALLOTMENTS. Passed as reported S.338, which authorizes cotton and wheat allotments of any farm to be protected even though such crops have not been planted for the past 3 years, if the normal history of the farm has been upset because of war-crop production; authorizes wheat, cotton, and peanut allotments to be protected if the owner or operator has been serving in the armed forces; and authorizes an upward adjustment for peanut acreage on farms where the peanut acreage is below the normal history of the farm (pp. 909-10).
2. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE. Passed, 198-171, without amendment H.J.Res. 85, appropriating \$6,784,000 additional for the census of agriculture for the fiscal year 1945 (pp. 903-9).
Rejected (153-177, 179-193) Rep. Taber's (N.Y.) motions for Committee of the Whole to report the resolution to the House with the resolving clause stricken (pp. 903-4); and to recommit with instructions to report it amended to prohibit deferment because of employment in connection with the census (pp. 907-8).
Rejected amendments by:
Rep. Andresen, Minn., 90-142, to reduce the amount to be appropriated to \$2,500,000 (pp. 904-6) after rejecting Rep. Rich's (Pa.) amendment to the Andresen amendment by reducing the amount to \$1 (pp. 905-6); and
Rep. Vorys, Ohio, 89-144, to prohibit deferment from military/service or essential because of employment in connection with the taking, preparing, compiling, or publishing of the Quinquennial Census of Agriculture (pp. 906-7)
3. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. Began general debate on H.P.1984 (pp. 910-29, 932). (For bill's provisions see Digest 21.) Reps. Woodrum, Va., and Cannon, Mo., discussed the bill's provisions (pp. 910-9). Rep. Wigglesworth, Mass., criticized the size of the appropriations, urged GAO audit of all financial transactions, and inserted tables showing unobligated balances of appropriations as of Nov. 30, 1944 (pp. 920-8).
4. LOAN AGENCIES. Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment S.375, separating RFC and subsidiaries from the Commerce Department (H.Rept.60) (p.936).

5. COMMODITY CREDIT. Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H.R. 2023, to continue CCC as a U.S. agency, to increase its borrowing power, etc. (H. Rept. 58) (p. 936). The bill provides for increasing CCC's borrowing power by \$2,000,000,000; that during the present war and for two years thereafter CCC shall not sell any farm commodity at less than parity or comparable price, except that this restriction shall not apply to (1) sales for new or byproduct uses, (2) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil, (3) sales for export, (4) sales for seed or feed, provided that no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at less than parity price for corn at the time such sale is made, (5) sales of deteriorated commodities if there is danger of waste through spoilage, or (6) sales for the purpose of establishing claims for fraud; for the method of determining the parity price for 7/8 Middling cotton "at the average location"; that the prohibition against subsidy payments in the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944 shall not apply to CCC in its operations designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities, or to absorb costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods; for annual appraisal of CCC assets as of June 30 on the basis of the cost of such assets to CCC, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is lower; and that CCC shall continue as a U.S. agency until June 30, 1947.

6. FARM LABOR. Rep. Flannagan, Va., criticized Selective Service's handling of the farm-labor induction situation and inserted the Tydings amendment, SSS's directive and supplement, and General Hershey's editorial and testimony in connection with this situation. Rep. Flannagan inserted also his proposed amendment to H.R. 1752, the May national-service bill, which "would clear up the matter and force the Selective Service to construe the Tydings amendment as the Congress intended it should be construed" (pp. 932-4).

7. APPROPRIATIONS. Received (Feb. 6) from the President supplemental appropriation estimates as follows:

National Housing Agency, \$90,000,000 for wartime housing (H. Doc. 52);

Federal Works Agency, \$23,000,000, for financing public-works programs (H. Doc. 53); and

Interior Department, \$36,000 for the administration of the Grazing Service; and \$126,000 for the Reclamation Bureau for continuing construction of the Colorado River project, Tex. (H. Doc. 66). To Appropriations Committee.

8. VEHICLES. Received (Feb. 6) from the President a proposed provision in the form of an amendment to the Budget limiting to \$1,500 the amount which Government agencies may pay for automobiles (H. Doc. 57). To Appropriations Committee.

SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Thurs., Feb. 8.

BILLS INTRODUCED

9. PURCHASING. H. R. 2030, by Rep. Wasielewski, Wis., to replace the present cost-plus and other systems of contracting for public construction by a system of negotiated lump-sum contracts. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 936.) Remarks of author (p. A520-2).

10. PROPERTY ACQUISITION. H. R. 2034, by Rep. Whitten, Miss., to make more uniform a trial on the issue of compensation in cases of condemnation of property and H. R. 2035, making more uniform trial of the issue of compensation in cases of condemnation of property. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 936.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am informed, but I hope incorrectly, that the American Dental Association has rendered a report to the advisory committee of the Committee on Education providing what is known as a numerus clausus—religious clause—for entrance into the various dental colleges. This should be a subject for the deliberations and investigations of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. The American Dental Association has the temerity to seek grants in aid from our Government, a democracy, in one breath and in the other breath seeks to smite our Bill of Rights, the very keystone of our democracy, by providing for religious tests for entrance into dental colleges. That is indeed un-American and should be investigated by the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Veterans of Foreign Wars approving the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am getting tired of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] raising the Jewish question in the House, and then jumping on every man who says anything about it.

Why attack the American Dental Association? That organization has done what it had a right to do. I wonder if the gentleman knew that 90 percent of the doctors who get on the civil-service roll are Jews, and 60 percent of the doctors we are compelled to accept in our veterans hospitals are Jews.

Remember that the white gentiles of this country have some rights.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Anderson, Calif.	Geelan	May
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Morrison
Barden	Grant, Ind.	Mott
Bates, Mass.	Green	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hancock	Pfelfer
Boren	Hand	Powers
Bradley, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Rains
Buckley	Havener	Reed, Ill.
Chelf	Hébert	Rees, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Heldinger	Rivers
Colmer	Hess	Sasser
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Satterfield
De Lacy	Izac	Sheridan
Delaney,	Jenkins	Smith, Va.
John J.	Kelley, Pa.	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Kilday	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	Kirwan	Towe
Elliott	LaFollette	White
Elsaesser	Lyle	Winter
Fernandez	McGehee	
Gardner	McGlinchey	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, with Mr. MURPHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose last night the joint resolution had been read, and it is now under consideration under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolving clause be stricken out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we are here today determining whether we have a sense of responsibility to the people back home who sent us here, determining whether we are going to hire 27,000 people who ought to be devoting themselves to the war effort but who will be gathering statistics and that sort of thing, information which is already available so far as they are of any value. The cost of this item over all will be nearly \$15,000,000. Last week we passed a bill requiring people to work or fight. Now we are asked to pass a bill to take people out of work which is classed as

essential industry and put them to work at something which we do not need, involving a waste of Federal funds. Is the House going to be false to its responsibility? Is it going to say to the people back home that we do not appreciate the responsibility which was entrusted to us in this time of war when there are all sorts of labor shortages and when there is a demand that we build up the armed forces and take people out of industrial activities? For my part there has never been a clearer proposition. There has already been spent, insofar as we have a report of it, \$254,000. Perhaps \$2,000,000 more has been obligated—I do not know. We might better pass that up than make a mistake in passing this bill which provides nothing of real value to the country but wastes money and interferes with the manpower and production in our country. I hope that the House will meet its responsibility and turn this proposition down completely and vote for this motion.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to say to the gentleman I read very carefully the debate on yesterday, and I do not want this moment to pass without paying a great tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky. You cannot read a speech like that or hear remarks like that and not be convinced of what our duty is at this hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, this question was exhaustively debated yesterday. Every phase of it was discussed in debate that consumed most of the afternoon. There is no necessity for again threshing it over this morning. Every business, commercial, labor, industrial, and agricultural organization in the country favors the bill. There has not been a single editorial in any newspaper or other periodical in the country against it. There has been no criticism of it by any competent national authority. As I said yesterday, Mr. Chairman, there is no opposition to this bill anywhere in the United States except on this floor.

In view of this situation, may I call the attention of the House this morning to the fact that we are now waiting to take up in the House the first of the annual supply bills, the independent offices appropriation bill. We would like to get through with as much of the general debate today as possible. My good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for whose aggressive and militant statesmanship I have the warmest admiration, said frankly on the floor yesterday that this bill would be passed; that Members on that side understand that enactment of the bill is inevitable. That being true, I trust the House will bear with me today if from time to time I move to close debate in order to expedite consideration to get an early vote, and proceed with the consideration of the general appropriation bill now waiting to be called up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 105; noes 131.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 153, noes 177.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 1, line 7, after the word "by", strike out "\$6,784,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted, the Bureau of the Census will have available for the taking of the census the sum of \$10,145,725. The 1940 census cost \$9,671,840. Thus there would be nearly \$475,000 more under this proposal of mine than was expended in 1940.

I realize that approximately \$2,500,000 has been expended to date and it is because of that amount already having been used, that many Members think the work should be completed. The fact remains, also, that many of us, myself included, feel that this entire proposition should be delayed until after the war.

It is evident that the majority now in control of the House are bound and determined to see this bill passed, war or no war. Assuming that to be the case, I am hopeful that there are a sufficient number of members on the majority side of the House who will join with the minority in accepting a compromise which will do the job and yet save millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

Yesterday, I brought out that we already have much information, concerning practically every farm in the Nation, gathered by the A. A. A. committeemen, nearly 110,000 of them, in every county of our land. The assembling of this information has been accomplished at a cost of a good many millions of dollars.

Just why should it be necessary for the Bureau of the Census to pay enumerators an average of \$1.02 for each farm schedule? Why cannot this be done through the A. A. A., for not over 40 cents per farm? A saving of 60 percent in the field would mean a saving of practically the amount my amendment seeks to cut out of this bill, a little over \$4,000,000. Other savings could be made by the elimination of irrelevant questions.

The rural carrier comes to practically every farm home in America. Why cannot this carrier bring the necessary blanks to be filled out to the farmer, instead of having this tremendous travel duplicated by a huge number of enumerators? The farmer could in his own time secure the facts from his own records, and is certainly able to do so without an enumerator at his elbow.

Cannot the various A. A. A.'s mail these out to the farmers in their counties? The addresses of all farmers in the county are on file, the county committee has much of the information as to acreage already for every farm in the county. My home A. A. A. committee knows exactly what has been produced on my farm for a good many years past. Why in the name of common sense does not the Bureau of the Census use this fund of information?

It would require 2 additional clerks in each of the approximate 3,000 county committees to do the necessary work in mailing out, tabulating, and checking the incoming returns from the farmers. These 6,000 clerks could do the work far more efficiently than could the 28,000 enumerators, and can send in the returns to national headquarters without a host of supervisors and State set-ups being required.

I know there would be a few farmers who would not report immediately, but in these isolated cases the local township committeeman could drive over to this neighbor of his and secure the necessary information.

A year ago I protested in this House as to the wasteful methods used and still being used, in the payment of the so-called dairy feed subsidy allowances. Rather than allow my local creamery to add the few cents per pound of butterfat to my cream check each month, and then have that creamery reimbursed by the Government, individual payments are calculated, individual checks are made out, thousands of tons of paper and hundreds of thousands of hours of manpower are wasted every month.

Members of this House, I offer this amendment in all sincerity. We can save manpower, we can save millions of dollars, and yet secure an accurate farm census.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the preliminary statement made this morning, I now move to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Missouri will not do that. I was recognized on this bill last night.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My motion applies only to the pending amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are supposed to have debate on both sides of the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I heard the gentleman's statement and my understanding is that he said he would make that motion on any amendment that was a frivolous amendment. May I ask the distinguished chairman if he regards as frivolous an amendment which goes directly to the bill and merely proposes a change in the amount, but a very substantial change, approximating \$4,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have not intimated at any time that the amendment is frivolous. I consider it a perfecting amendment and a well-considered amendment. My only purpose in making the motion is to expedite consideration. As I explained in the beginning,

we have another bill ahead of us which we hope to take up today. Does the gentleman desire 5 additional minutes?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not on this amendment alone; no.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No one on this side desires to debate the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; they do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With, I trust, the concurrence of both sides of the House, Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's motion is not debatable.

Mr. RANKIN. Then we will have to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to close debate on the pending amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to the opponents of this measure for just a moment. I think you are making a serious mistake, and I am going to tell you why.

I am on the Committee on the Census. As I said, I was on that committee when the first agricultural census was taken. It is more important today than it has ever been in the history of this country. Since 1935 farm life in America has changed more than it had in 50 years prior to that time. Since 1935 we have built more than 450,000 miles of rural power lines and have electrified more than a million farm homes.

In 1935 I put the statistics in the RECORD to show that only one farm home out of 10 in America was electrified, whereas 9 out of 10 in Germany, Japan, France, Italy, and the Scandinavian countries had electricity at that time, and that Holland and Switzerland had their farms practically 100 percent electrified.

The farmers want this information. The farmers in your districts are interested in this information because when this war is over we expect to spend \$1,000,000,000 electrifying the farm homes that do not now enjoy the use of electricity. The ones who do not have electricity are anxious to get it.

The idea that you can have the rural letter carriers get this information is most ridiculous. How long do you think it would take the rural carrier to make his rounds if he had to take one of these questionnaires and submit it to everybody on his route?

I hope you will not make a partisan issue of this matter. Electricity is non-partisan. It serves them all alike. It is the greatest servant mankind has ever known and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford. We want to see it supplied to every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We like to follow the gentleman, we just love him, but we cannot go along with everything he has.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that 58 percent of the farm homes in Michigan are without electricity today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But our farmers can read and write, and that is more than yours can do.

Mr. RANKIN. If your farmers can read in the dark, what could they do if they had lights?

I notice, with all deference, that the very men who have spoken the loudest against this proposed legislation voted in 1938 against my amendment to provide the first \$100,000,000 to electrify the farm homes in your States and mine. I hope you will not vote against this measure, but will let it go through, in order that we may acquire this information for every congressional district in the United States, because it is vital and it is necessary; and the amount expended will be well spent, in view of the fact that we expect, when this war is over, to spend at least \$1,000,000,000 electrifying the rest of the farm homes of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee closed debate on the pending amendment and it must necessarily be put to a vote.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Chair permitted the gentleman from Mississippi to interrupt at that point, and it seems to me the gentleman from Nebraska should have the same right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has made no motion.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Is it right that after one Member has an opportunity to speak 5 minutes on that side on the pending motion and then the Chairman recognizes the chairman of the committee to ask for a vote on the amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, all debate on this amendment has been closed. They can offer amendments, but they cannot debate them.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered a new motion, an amendment to the amendment. Is that right?

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have not heard the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$1."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this country is at war and if the Members of Congress do not know it, they will know it pretty soon. It will not only be a war against Germany and Japan but there will be a war in this country of ours to get rid of the New Deal, and get rid of it very quickly. We want a square deal—one that will keep America safe. I want to say here that I resent the work of this Committee today in trying to stifle the Members of the House in the discussion of this bill. In my judgment it is a ridiculous bill to bring before the House of Representatives at this time. In my business or in any other sound sensible business back home we have things to do while we are in this war, and we do the essential things, we do the necessary things, we do the things that are important and vital to the winning of this war and in the production of goods and material to that end. But here in Congress where we are supposed to set the example, you come in here with a ridiculous bill such as this and ask the people of this country today to take a census, when you have all the facts which this census will bring to light at the present time in the Agriculture Department. All the facts are available at the present time, and if the Members of Congress do not know those facts, they should know them because they are available. Now, I do not want to chastise the Congress, but I am absolutely disgusted with the proceedings of yesterday and today on this little bill providing for, what someone said yesterday, was a mere \$15,000,000. I want to tell you that back home where I come from 10 pennies make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. You have this country so involved in national debt that the country is going to be ruined. This national debt did not all come about because of the war. You started in 1933 with a per capita debt of \$155.93. Before the war started the per capita debt was \$325.66, after you started to spend, spend, spend, and elect, elect, elect. Now you have raised the debt to \$1,486 per person in the United States. That is a serious situation. Yet you come in today and say \$15,000,000 is a little item. You are going to wreck this Nation if you do not turn the tables and get down to brass tacks and common sense. It is serious. You can call yourselves a Democratic Administration or New Deal or whatever you want to, but unless you use some common sense it is going to wreck the Nation. I am a Republican and glad of it. But if my party came in with a bill such as this, at this time while at war, I would tell them to take a back seat. I would not vote for it. I absolutely would not do it. I cannot see for the life of me why you have to

force this down the throats of the men here in Congress. If this joint resolution becomes law, it will be evidence of the complete loss of every scintilla of good common sense in the expenditure of Government funds, which already represent a huge burden on the taxpayers of the country. The taxes that you have imposed on the people of this country are going to wreck this Nation. Perhaps the New Deal Members want to vote on this but I can sense that they are forced to vote for it. You are going to vote on it but you are going to be held responsible. If you think that the C. I. O. and the P. A. C. are going to pull you through, wait until the people wake up. When the people of America find that they have reached the limit of taxation, the limit of burdensome laws, the limit of reports, and the limits on census. I look for an awakening of the responsibilities of the American people in order that they save themselves from a financial wreck and from the ills of the laws passed by the New Deal.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the political and New Deal hysteria which seemed to be present on my left yesterday would subside overnight. This is not a political question and I am sorry to see politics brought into a question that vitally affects the farmers of America.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not yield. I only have 5 minutes. I say it is not a political question.

Mr. TABER. Why do you bring it in?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. This law was enacted by a Republican Congress back in 1924. I think that Congress acted wisely. We might just as well be honest with one another and face the facts. Under Republican administrations in 1925 and 1930 the personnel was more or less selected from among Republicans, just as the postmasters were selected. Under the Democratic administrations in 1935 and 1940 the majority of the personnel was selected from Democrats. We all realize this. Then why can we not take a common-sense view? We have talked about everything except the necessity for this farm survey. It is necessary. If it was necessary in 1925, 1930, 1935, and 1940, it is certainly necessary now; even more so, because we will need this data in working out post-war agriculture.

Post-war agriculture will be one of the most difficult problems this Congress or any other Congress ever tackled and we should have all the information possible to obtain, to guide us in correctly solving the problem.

Another thing, it is attempted to drag a red herring across the trail by saying we are interfering with manpower. You know and I know that under the provisions of the law everyone who engages in the census work will have to be cleared by the United States Employment Service. The determination will be made by that service as to whether or not the applicant is necessary to the war effort. If the applicant is found necessary to some other branch of the war effort a clearance slip will not be issued. You know and I know as a practical proposition, the personnel that has been selected has come from among school teachers, from the aged and from those whom the United States Employment Service has certified are not necessary to the war effort.

I appeal to you in the name of the farmers, and they are back of this legislation; I appeal to you in the name of the farm leaders and they are back of this legislation; I appeal to you in the name of the Secretary of Agriculture, and our old colleague, Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, who are also behind this bill to enact this law, and give those in charge of agriculture the necessary data.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 90, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to put in the RECORD at this point that I could not help but notice the fact that not a single Democrat in this House saw fit to support my amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I felt for a moment that I would not be ruled out I would propose an amendment today to take this money being appropriated for the agricultural census and use it to relieve some of the hard-pressed farmers and city dwellers in up-State New York from the snow and cold. There is an emergency up there. People are suffering from lack of fuel; the farmers are suffering from lack of ability to dig themselves out of their barnyards; yet here today we are quibbling over \$15,000,000 for an agricultural census, which money will not be spent until the snow is all melted. I hate to think of the floods that will swell the rivers of New York and Pennsylvania and ruin so much fertile land and so many good people. I

think it is a crime that we do not apply our energies to approving a relief program for those hard-pressed people in the Northeastern States, because they need help and need it badly.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does not the gentleman believe that this army of workers should have the benefit of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act? He will recall that the conscript labor bill which the gentleman and I opposed last week, contained such a provision?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I answer the gentleman by saying that it is a tragedy such a bill is proposed now when all over the farming country in up-State New York, Pennsylvania, and New England there is definite lack of farm help and they are not able even to carry on the process of dairying. I suppose some Member will rise and say that one does not plant crops in February, March, and April. My answer to that is that dairying is an all-year-around industry. How if we take men off the farm to participate in this agricultural census are they going to tend cows, feed the stock, and get milk to market? How are they going to make up that lost time and energy producing food for victory?

For the life of me I cannot see the necessity of such an asinine proposal, particularly in view of the fact that they are so short of men to work on the farms to say nothing of having enough to take an agricultural census. I for one want to go on record as being strongly opposed to the passage of such a resolution at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is not this bill a good bit like the New Deal and the cows the gentleman is talking about? They are milking somebody all the time?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let me state to the gentleman that I received a letter from a farmer in my district the other day in which he said: "How in God's name am I going to be able to prepare this agricultural census data with one hand and milk a cow with the other?"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has heard about this 60,000,000 job program. Maybe this is not waiting until the war is over to get these jobs going.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not as much concerned in this matter with where we are going to get the money to conduct this census, as to where we are going to get the people to work on it. I asked that question on the floor yesterday, where are we going to get the people to do this work, and I was refused an intelligent answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Most of them are working already. A great many of them are at work now. The question is, Will we pay them for the work they have already done?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Get a few of them up there where I come from to work on the farms so that they can produce milk, so that they can produce food for victory. They will do more to aid the war effort by developing calluses on their hands from manual labor than by pushing a pencil.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Will this increase the number in General Patton's army?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not think so.

Something will have to be done in order to get adequate farm labor. I am against the pending resolution. I want to have this money appropriated for other than worth-while projects, and I want to see concern on the part of Washington for my snowbound and fuel-less district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending resolution and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 128, noes 90.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 161, noes 117.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: After line 7, insert the following:

"No one shall be exempted or deferred under the Selective Service Act, or relieved from the assignment to essential industry or to agriculture under any law of Congress, by reason of being employed in preparing for, taking, compiling, or publishing the Quinquennial Census of Agriculture in the United States."

CENSORSHIP ON THE CENSUS BILL

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, events will prove that the Democratic leadership in the House out-smarted themselves when they censored all debate on this bill a little while ago and prevented my explaining my amendment to the agricultural census bill. This amendment merely provided that no one should be exempted or deferred under the selective-service laws or from assignment to essential war work or agricultural work under any laws of Congress by reason of being employed in the agricultural census. The same amendment was used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his motion to recommit. If the majority had not arbitrarily shut off debate, they would have learned what this amendment provided, and it is incon-

ceivable that it would have been defeated. Even under the steam-roller tactics which were used, this provision was only kept out of the bill on motion to recommit by a straight Democratic majority of 15 votes. The result is that 194 Democrats have said by their record votes that they felt this agricultural census was more important than fighting or than working in essential war work.

Of course, we know that these jobs are intended mainly for broken-down political hacks, but this vote making the job an impregnable pill box against war work may change things. The United States Employment Service may well say that the majority of this House considered this census as a war measure by insisting upon its passage at this time, and that by their vote on my amendment they classed this census as even more essential than the draft or work in war industries or in agriculture itself. Draft boards, looking at this vote, may say to the able-bodied young farmer who has secured an appointment as an enumerator: "Go ahead and count cows and hogs. You need not fight. You need not farm. You need not help make munitions. It is true that the Government already knows how many cows and hogs there are around here; it is outrageous to keep you out of the war or war work for the purpose of recounting them, but a majority in Congress has spoken, and we have no choice."

If the Democratic majority had permitted themselves the chance to find out what was involved in this amendment, at least enough of them to have changed the result would have voted for my amendment to show the intent of Congress that working and fighting in the war effort was more essential than taking this census. The defeat of my amendment in the Committee of the Whole without discussion or debate resulted in bringing it up in the motion or recommit without explanation or discussion, and the blind followers of their party machine now find themselves on record for hog recounting as more important than hog raising, for cow recounting as more important than making munitions, for sheep recounting as more important than fighting Japs and Germans. The only explanation of those who voted against this amendment will be "We didn't know what we were doing," and the reason they did not know was because they voted to keep themselves from knowing by arbitrarily shutting off debate. All of which shows that parliamentary censorship, like other forms of political censorship, sometimes hurts those who might have listened as well as those who might have talked.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 89, noes 144.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURPHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the

joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture, pursuant to House Resolution 120, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. TABER. I am opposed to the joint resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: After line 7 insert:

"No one shall be exempted or deferred under the Selective Service Act, or relieved from the assignment to essential industry or to agriculture under any law of Congress, by reason of being employed in preparing for, taking, compiling, or publishing the quinquennial census of agriculture in the United States."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a point of order against the motion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the point of order comes too late. On the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, the previous question has been ordered. This is not a general appropriation bill. It is simply a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the motion is not germane to the joint resolution and is, therefore, not in order. It introduces matter which is entirely foreign to the joint resolution pending before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must hold that this is not a general appropriation bill and the limitation does not apply. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that it is not germane to the joint resolution. It introduces a subject entirely foreign to the purpose of the joint resolution itself.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to ask the gentleman. Does this joint resolution make appropriation for the hiring of people?

Mr. TABER. It does.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think it does.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether or not this limitation,

which would be in force if the motion to recommit were adopted, would be applicable to the funds already appropriated in previous appropriation bills, or only to those carried in the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER. This limitation would go to funds under this resolution.

Mr. TARVER. Therefore, the funds appropriated in previous appropriation bills would not be affected thereby?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not think so. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion to recommit, and the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 193, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—179

Adams	Gavin	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Mason
Andersen,	Gerlach	Merrow
H. Carl	Gifford	Michener
Andresen,	Gillespie	Miller, Nebr.
August H.	Gillette	Mundt
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillie	Murray, Wls.
Angell	Goodwin	O'Hara
Arends	Graham	O'Konski
Arnold	Griffiths	O'Neal
Auchincloss	Gross	Phillips
Barrett, Wyo.	Gwynn, N. Y.	Pittenger
Barry	Gwynne, Iowa	Ploeser
Beall	Hagen	Plumley
Bender	Hale	Poage
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall	Ramey
Bennett, Mo.	Edwin Arthur	Rayfield
Blshop	Hall,	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Rich
Brehm	Hartley	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Henry	Robertson,
Brumbaugh	Herter	N. Dak.
Buck	Heseltun	Robison, Ky.
Buffett	Hill	Rockwell
Butler	Hinshaw	Rodgers, Pa.
Byrnes, Wls.	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Campbell	Hoffman	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Holmes, Wash.	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Hope	Scrivner
Case, N. J.	Horan	Shafer
Case, S. Dak.	Howell	Sharp
Chenoweth	Hull	Short
Chlperfield	Jennings	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Kans.	Jones	Springer
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Stefan
Corbett	Judd	Stevenson
Crawford	Kean	Stockman
Cunningham	Kearney	Sumner, Ill.
Curtis	Keefe	Sundstrom
Delaney,	Kelly, Ill.	Taber
James J.	Kilburn	Talle
Dirksen	Klinzer	Taylor
Dolliver	Knutson	Tibbott
Dondero	Kunkel	Vorrs, Ohio
Dworshak	Landis	Vursell
Ellis	LeCompte	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Walter
Elsaesser	Lemke	Welchel
Elston	Lewis	Welch
Engel, Mich.	Luce	Wigglesworth
Fellows	McConnell	Wilson
Fenton	McCowan	Wolcott
Fisher	McDonough	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fuller	McGregor	Wolverton, N. J.
Fulton	McMillen, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gamble	Martin Iowa	

NAYS—193

Abernethy	Bland	Burch
Allen, La.	Bloom	Burgin
Anderson,	Bonner	Byrne, N. Y.
N. Mex.	Boykin	Camp
Andrews, Ala.	Bradley, Pa.	Cannon, Fla.
Baldwin, Md.	Brooks	Cannon, Mo.
Barrett, Pa.	Brown, Ga.	Carnahan
Bates, Ky.	Bryson	Celler
Beckworth	Bulwinkle	Chapman
Bell	Bunker	Clark

Clements	Johnson,	Rabaut
Coffee	Luther A.	Rabin
Combs	Johnson,	Rains
Cooley	Lyndon B.	Ramspeck
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Randolph
Courtney	Kee	Rankin
Cravens	Kefauver	Resa
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Richards
Daughton, Va.	Kerr	Riley
Davis	King	Robertson, Va.
Dawson	Kirwan	Robinson, Utah
Dickstein	Kopplemann	Roe, Md.
Domengeaux	Lane	Roe, N. Y.
Doughton, N. C.	Lanham	Rogers, Fla.
Douglas, Calif.	Larcade	Rogers, N. Y.
Douglas, Ill.	Lea	Rooney
Doyle	Lesinski	Rowan
Drewry	Link	Russell
Durham	Ludlow	Ryter
Earthman	Lynch	Sabath
Eberhart	McCormack	Sadowski
Engle, Calif.	McGehee	Savage
Ervin	McKenzie	Sheppard
Fallon	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes
Feighan	Mahon	Slaughter
Flannagan	Maloney	Snyder
Flood	Manasco	Sparkman
Fogarty	Mansfield,	Spence
Folger	Mont.	Starkey
Forand	Mansfield, Tex.	Stewart
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Stigler
Gathings	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Gibson	Mills	Summers, Tex.
Gordon	Monroney	Tarver
Gorski	Morgan	Thom
Gossett	Murdock	Thomas, Tex.
Granahan	Murphy	Thomason
Granger	Murray, Tenn.	Tolan
Grant, Ala.	Neely	Torrens
Green	Norrell	Traynor
Gregory	Norton	Trimble
Hare	O'Brien, Ill.	Vinson
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.	Voorhis, Calif.
Harris	Outland	Wasielewski
Hart	Pace	Weaver
Hays	Patman	West
Healy	Patrick	Whitten
Hedrick	Patterson	Whittington
Heffernan	Peterson, Fla.	Wickersham
Hendricks	Peterson, Ga.	Winstead
Hobbs	Pickett	Wood
Holifield	Powell	Woodhouse
Hook	Price, Fla.	Woodrum, Va.
Huber	Price, Ill.	Worley
Jackson	Priest	Zimmerman
Jarman	Quinn, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—59

Anderson, Calif.	Fernandez	May
Bailey	Gardner	Morrison
Baldwin, N. Y.	Geelan	Mott
Barden	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Hand	Pfeifer
Biemiller	Harness, Ind.	Philbin
Boren	Havener	Powers
Buckley	Hébert	Rees, Kans.
Chelf	Heidinger	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Sasser
Colmer	Hoch	Satterfield
Cox	Holmes, Mass.	Sheridan
Crosser	Izac	Smith, Va.
Curley	Jenkins	Somers, N. Y.
De Lacy	Kelley, Pa.	Talbot
Delaney,	Kilday	Thomas, N. J.
John J.	LaFollette	Towe
Dingell	Lyle	Weiss
Eaton	McGlinchey	White
Elliott	Madden	Winter

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Chelf against.
 Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Izac against.
 Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Fernandez against.
 Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
 Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Madden against.
 Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Buckley against.
 Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Morrison against.
 Mr. Rees of Kansas for, with Mr. John J. Delaney against.
 Mr. Talbot for, with Mr. Hoch against.

Mr. Winter for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
 General pairs:
 Mr. Gardner with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Powers.
 Mr. Curley with Mr. Towe.
 Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
 Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Hand.
 Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Anderson of California.
 Mr. Biemiller with Mr. LaFollette.
 Mr. Weiss with Mr. Heidinger.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Mott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 198, nays 171, answered "present" 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—198

Abernethy	Granger	Peterson, Fla.
Allen, La.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Anderson,	Green	Philbin
N. Mex.	Gregory	Pickett
Andrews, Ala.	Hare	Poage
Bailey	Harless, Ariz.	Powell
Baldwin, Md.	Harris	Price, Fla.
Barrett, Pa.	Hart	Price, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Hays	Priest
Beckworth	Healy	Quinn, N. Y.
Bell	Hedrick	Rabaut
Bland	Heffernan	Rabin
Bloom	Hendricks	Rains
Bonner	Hobbs	Ramspeck
Boykin	Holifield	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Hook	Rankin
Brooks	Huber	Resa
Brown, Ga.	Jackson	Richards
Bryson	Jarman	Riley
Bulwinkle	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Bunker	Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Burch	Johnson,	Roe, Md.
Byrne, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Roe, N. Y.
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Rogers, N. Y.
Cannon, Mo.	Kefauver	Rooney
Carnahan	Keogh	Rowan
Celler	Kerr	Russell
Chapman	King	Ryter
Clark	Kirwan	Sabath
Clements	Knutson	Sadowski
Coffee	Kopplemann	Savage
Combs	Lane	Sheppard
Cooley	Lanham	Sikes
Cooper	Larcade	Slaughter
Courtney	Lea	Snyder
Cravens	Lesinski	Sparkman
D'Alesandro	Link	Spence
Daughton, Va.	Ludlow	Starkey
Davis	Lynch	Stewart
Dawson	McCormack	Stigler
Dickstein	McGehee	Sullivan
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Summers, Tex.
Doughton, N. C.	McMillan, S. C.	Tarver
Douglas, Calif.	Mahon	Thom
Douglas, Ill.	Maloney	Thomas, Tex.
Doyle	Manasco	Thomason
Drewry	Mansfield,	Tolan
Durham	Mont.	Torrens
Earthman	Mansfield, Tex.	Traynor
Eberhart	Marcantonio	Trimble
Engle, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Ervin	Mills	Voorhis, Calif.
Fallon	Monroney	Wasielewski
Feighan	Morgan	Weaver
Fisher	Murdock	West
Flannagan	Murphy	Whitten
Flood	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
Folger	Neely	Wickersham
Forand	Norrell	Winstead
Gallagher	Norton	Wolverton, N. J.
Gathings	O'Brien, Ill.	Wood
Gibson	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodhouse
Gordon	Outland	Woodrum, Va.
Gorski	Pace	Worley
Gossett	Patman	Zimmerman
Granahan	Patrick	

NAYS—171

Adams	Gearhart	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Mason
Andersen,	Gifford	Morrow
H. Carl	Gillespie	Michener
Andresen,	Gillette	Miller, Nebr.
August H.	Gillie	Mundt
Andrews, N. Y.	Goodwin	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Graham	O'Hara
Arends	Griffiths	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Gross	O'Neal
Barrett, Wyo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Phillips
Barry	Gwynne, Iowa	Pittenger
Beall	Hagen	Ploesser
Bender	Hale	Plumley
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall,	Ramey
Bennett, Mo.	Edwin Arthur	Rayfiel
Bishop	Hall,	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Rich
Brehm	Hartley	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Henry	Robertson,
Brumbaugh	Hertter	N. Dak.
Buck	Heseltan	Robison, Ky.
Buffett	Hill	Rockwell
Butler	Hinshaw	Rodgers, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Campbell	Hoffman	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Holmes, Wash.	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Hope	Scrivner
Case, N. J.	Howell	Shafer
Case, S. Dak.	Hull	Sharp
Chilperfield	Jennings	Short
Church	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Claason	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Maine
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Kans.	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Springer
Corbett	Judd	Stefan
Cunningham	Kean	Stevenson
Curtis	Kearney	Stockman
Delaney,	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
James J.	Kelly, Ill.	Sundstrom
Dirksen	Kilburn	Taber
Dolliver	Kinzer	Talle
Dondero	Kunkel	Taylor
Dworshak	Landis	Tibbott
Ellis	LeCompte	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Vursell
Elsaesser	Lemke	Wadsworth
Elston	Lewis	Walter
Engel, Mich.	Luce	Weichel
Fellows	McConnell	Welch
Fenton	McDonough	Wigglesworth
Fuller	McGregor	Wilson
Gamble	McMillen, Ill.	Wolcott
Gavin	Martin, Iowa	Wolfenden, Pa.
		Woodruff, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Chenoweth

NOT VOTING—61

Anderson, Calif.	Fernandez	Madden
Arnold	Fogarty	May
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gardner	Morrison
Barden	Geelan	Mott
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hand	Pfeifer
Boren	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Buckley	Havener	Rees, Kans.
Chelf	Hébert	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Heidinger	Sasser
Colmer	Hess	Satterfield
Cox	Hoch	Sheridan
Crawford	Holmes, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Horan	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Izac	Talbot
De Lacy	Jenkins	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney,	Kelley, Pa.	Towe
John J.	Kilday	Weiss
Dingell	LaFollette	White
Eaton	Lyle	Winter
Elliott	McGlinchey	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.
 Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
 Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Grant of Indiana against.
 Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.

Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Harness against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. John J. Delaney for, with Mr. Rees of Kansas against.

Mr. Hoch for, with Mr. Talbot against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Winter against.

Mr. Somers of New York for, with Mr. Hess against.

General pairs:

Mr. Gardner with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Biemiller with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. May with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Mott.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Horan.

Mr. NORRELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. FERNANDEZ. Were he present he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAYLOR] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been informed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] that this bill will not take much time and on that understanding has recognized him to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. If that should prove not to be the case, the Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia to withdraw his request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the bill been reported?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Chair understands the bill has been reported with

amendments. The Chair is recognizing the gentleman from Virginia on the theory that this bill is going to take very little time, as was stated by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to ask the gentleman if it is not very important that this bill be passed at once in order to further the war food production effort inasmuch as many farmers are awaiting the passage of this bill in order to determine whether they will put in war crops.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is true.

That is the reason the bill was rushed through the Senate and that is the reason I am anxious to get it through the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. After a full and complete hearing, it was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture.

The provisions of the bill are simple and easily understood. Under the present law if wheat, cotton, and peanut farm allotments are not used for 3 years, they are lost. Many wheat and cotton farmers at the request of the War Food Administrator have diverted their acreages to vital war crops. Then, too, many cotton, wheat, and peanut growers have been called to the service and hence are unable to plant. The bill simply preserves the rights of these farmers during the emergency.

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the farm program, let me go into the matter a little more in detail.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, farm acreage allotments were established based upon the past production history of each individual farm. With respect to wheat and cotton the act provides that if a farmer fails to plant such crops for a period of 3 years in succession, he thereby loses his farm acreage allotment. Having lost his farm acreage allotment by failure to produce for 3 succeeding years, the only way the farmer can get back into the production of wheat and cotton is to come in as a new grower, which means that his farm acreage allotment would be greatly reduced. In the case of cotton only 2 percent of the State acreage allotment is apportioned to new growers, and in the case of wheat only 3 percent of the county allotment is apportioned to new growers. This means, of course, that a farmer who loses farm acreage allotment, and later desires to come back under the farm program, comes back with his farm acreage allotment greatly reduced.

During the past 2 years many growers of wheat and cotton, at the request of the War Food Administrator, have used their entire acreages previously planted to wheat and cotton for the production of vital war crops. While most of these farmers desire to continue to cooperate in the war food program, they hesitate to go along further, knowing that if they do they will lose their old farm-acreage

allotments, and after the emergency, in order to reestablish their farm-acreage allotments they will have to come back under the farm program as new growers. This means that their patriotic response to the request of the War Food Administrator would be penalized by a reduction of their farm acreage allotments. It is simply asking too much of the cotton and wheat growers to go along further with the War Food Administrator unless their farm acreages are protected. So much for the wheat and cotton farmers who are left at home. How about the wheat and cotton farmers who have been called into the service? Why, the farmers who have been called into the service and for this reason are unable to plant for 3 successive years, would also lose their farm-acreage allotments. Now all the bill does is to protect the acreage allotments of these two classes of farmers—those who have responded to the war effort by diverting their acreages to vital war crops and those who have been called into the service—until after the emergency.

With respect to peanuts the same 3-year limitation applies. However, peanuts are a vital war crop, and no encouragement should be given the peanut grower to change to other crops. While this is true, the peanut farmer who has been called to the service, and who thereby stands to lose his farm-acreage allotment, should be protected. Hence, the bill only protects the acreage allotment of the peanut grower who has been called into the service.

Planting season is close at hand, and for this reason it is imperative that this legislation be passed at once. If the legislation is not passed, many cotton, wheat, and peanut growers who have been called into the service will lose their farm-acreage allotments, and many cotton and wheat growers—patriotic farmers who desire to cooperate with the War Food Administrator—will be forced to discontinue their cooperation and go back to the production of wheat and cotton in order to protect their farm-acreage allotments.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this matter has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I recognize it is necessary to pass this bill promptly. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. As he knows, I offered an amendment in committee which would permit farmers to plant corn for ensilage purposes outside of the regular corn acreage allotment. Corn is not covered in this bill. Therefore, my amendment would not be germane at this time. But due to the need for farmers to raise their own fodder, I want to ask the chairman of our committee if he will not permit the consideration of such legislation and help us bring it out on the floor of the House.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I will say to the gentleman we will do that as soon as we can get to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in establishing acreage allotments under subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations prescribed by him, may provide that for any crop year (beginning with the crop year 1945) during the present emergency any farm, with respect to which a cotton or wheat allotment was established for the 1942 crop, shall be regarded as a farm on which cotton or wheat, as the case may be, was planted, if the Secretary determines that, because of the production of war crops designated by him on such farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States, the cotton or wheat production history of the farm for such year is not representative of the normal history of the farm.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "cotton", strike out the word "or."

On page 2, line 3, after the word "wheat", insert the words "or peanut."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "cotton", strike out the word "or."

On page 2, line 5, after the word "wheat", insert "or peanuts."

On page 2, line 5, after the word "be", strike out the word "was" and insert the word "were."

Line 6, after the word "planted", insert the words "and grown."

Line 6, after the word "that", insert the words "with respect to cotton or wheat."

Line 8, after the word "or", insert the words "with respect to cotton, wheat, or peanuts."

Line 11, before the word "wheat", strike out the word "or."

Line 11, after the word "wheat" insert the words "or peanut."

On line 13 insert the words:

"The Secretary may also provide with respect to any such farm that the past acreage of peanuts shall be adjusted upward to the extent that the acreage used for growing peanuts on such farm in such year is below the normal history of the farm."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat, and peanuts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[Mr. PACE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein two speeches, one by a former Senator from Oklahoma, Hon. Robert L. Owen, and another by former Senator Gore, on the occasion of the eighty-ninth birthday of Senator Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement by the American Labor Party on the matter of the policy of the United States Government in Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to appear immediately following the passage of the A. A. A. bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to appear immediately following my amendment to the census bill, in view of the fact that debate was limited and I did not have an opportunity to explain my amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and in the first to include a speech by Senator VANDENBERG, and in the second an editorial thereon, which I ask to follow immediately after the speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include correspondence on the War Manpower's division between critical and essential industries, and in the other to include a very fine article on the rehabilitation of soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday upon the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders I may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984), making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself, and continue through the afternoon. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the bill comes to the House with a unanimous report from the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. I know of no controversial features in the bill, but there are a number of Members who desire to speak. It will be the intention to remain in session today as long as gentlemen are willing to remain, and to have some debate tomorrow and conclude the debate in time to finish the bill tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1984, the independent offices appropriations bill, 1946, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first of the major appropriation bills of this session of the Congress. I am very glad to say that it comes to the House with the unanimous report of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. If there is any controversial feature in it I do not know about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not want the chairman to proceed under the illusion that there may not be some amendments offered to the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understand that; but when I say "controversial features" I mean no fundamental difference of opinion. Some amendments may be offered and points of order presented, but generally speaking the committee was in agreement.

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 85

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 12, 1945

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945
for the Census of Agriculture.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the amount named in the appropriation contained in
4 the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, for
5 preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quin-
6 quennial Census of Agriculture of the United States is hereby
7 increased by \$6,784,000.

Passed the House of Representatives February 7, 1945.

Attest:

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the
fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture.

FEBRUARY 12, 1945

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

6. PETITIONS. Received petitions and resolutions favoring continuance of the Small Business Committee, ratification of the U.S.-Mexican Water Treaty, enactment of the McCarren-Sumners administrative-procedure bill, and allocation of large quotas of farm machinery (pp. 1141-2).
7. NATIONAL SERVICE. Sen. Austin, Vt., inserted his National Republican Dinner address in which he spoke favoring national service legislation (pp. 1138-9).
8. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Sen. Magnuson, Wash., was appointed to the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee, vice Sen. Mitchell, Wash., and Sen. Mitchell was appointed to the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, vice Sen. Magnuson (p. 1140).
9. MINERALS. Sen. McFarland, Ariz., urged favorable consideration for his bill S. 502, to permit extension of premium payments on strategic and critical metals and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products (p. 1149).
10. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE. Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H.J. Res. 85, appropriating \$6,784,000 additional for the census of agriculture for the fiscal year 1945 (S.Rept. 49) (p. 1142).
11. TRANSPORTATION. Interstate Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 47, making miscellaneous amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act (S.Rept. 52) (p. 1142).
12. FINANCIAL STATEMENT. Received Treasury's annual report on the state of finances for the fiscal year 1944. To Finance Committee. (pp. 1140).
13. PERSONNEL; SELECTIVE SERVICE. System submitted a report of registrants deferred as of Dec. 1, 1944, because of Federal employment. To Military Affairs Committee. (p. 1140).
14. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 19 (p. 1171).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY. H.R. 2203, by Rep. Cochran, Mo., & S. 555, by Sen. Murray, Mont., to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development in the interest of flood control and prevention, etc. Sen. Murray discussed his bill and urged enactment of such legislation, stating "This bill should be referred to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee...I want the bill to go to a committee which will give it fair and full hearing and consideration...not...to a committee which has preconceived ideas!" To the House Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee. (pp. 1197 and 1150-6).
16. PERSONNEL. S. 533, by Sen. Myers, Pa., to create civil service boards of appeals. To Civil Service Committee. (p. 1142.)
17. WATER POLLUTION. S. 535, by Rep. Myers, Pa., to prevent pollution of U. S. waters and to correct existing water pollution as a vital necessity to public health, economic welfare, healthful recreation, navigation, the support of invaluable aquatic life, and as a logical and desirable post-war public-works program. To Commerce Committee (p. 1142.)
18. FLAG. S. 539, by Sen. Andrews, Fla., to prevent desecration and mutilation of the U. S. flag. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 1142.)

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section

79th-1st, No. 29

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued February 16, 1945, for actions of Thursday, February 15, 1945)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

Administrative law.....6	Food production....4,21,25	Patents.....28
Adjournment.....14	Forestry.....5	Personnel.....13,16,29,31a
Banking and currency....23	Health.....38	Post-war planning.....36
Census of agriculture...10	Labor, farm....4,22,28a,34	Reclamation.....3,8,15
Committee assignment.....8	Law revision.....2	Reorganization.....26
Committee investigations31a	Loan agencies.....1	Selective service.....13,22
Commodity Credit.....39	Loans, farm.....27,30	Small business.....6,35
Daylight saving.....24	Machinery, farm.....6	Taxation.....32
Farm program.....31	Minerals.....9	Transportation.....10,19,20
Financial statement.....12	Missouri Valley Authority15	Veterans.....29
Flag.....18	National service.....7	Water utilization...6,17,33
		Wildlife conservation....37

HOUSE

1. LOAN AGENCIES. Regan debate on S.375, the George Commerce-RFC bill, after agreeing, 202-192, to the resolution providing for its consideration (pp. 1173-95). Rep. Whittington, Miss., discussed this Department's part in the establishment of the Export-Import Bank (pp. 1189-90). Rep. Spence, Ky., discussed the provision for audit of Government corporations, and stated, "I think the bill is intended to refer only to wholly Government-owned corporations. I think an amendment providing for audit of agencies 'owned or controlled' by the Federal Government would be exceedingly difficult of construction" (pp. 1179-80).
2. LAW REVISION. Revision of Laws Committee reported without amendment bills to codify and enact into positive law the following titles of the U.S. Code: Title 1, General Provisions (H.R. 2195); Title 4, Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States (H.R. 2196); Title 6, Official and Penal Bonds (H.R. 2197); Title 9, Arbitration (H.R. 2198); Title 17, Copyrights (H.R. 2199); and Title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure (H.R. 2200) (H.Repts. 147-52, respectively)(p. 1196).
3. RECLAMATION. Irrigation and Reclamation Committee reported without amendment H.R.1534, to amend the Fact Finders Act (H.Rept. 153)(pp.1196-7).

SENATE

4. CORN PRODUCTION; FARM LABOR. Sen. Wherry, Nebr., urged that "we do everything we can to see that the corn on the farms...is cribbed" and inserted a news release, "Campaign Opens to Save Wet Corn Worth One Hundred Million. Third of Crop to Spoil Soon if Uncribbed" (p. 1145).
5. FORESTRY. Sen. Magnuson, Wash., inserted his letter to Rep. Taryer favoring the establishment of a forest-products utilization service in the Pacific Northwest (pp. 1139-40).

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a just peace, maintained by a genuine world community, is surely faith's ideal; and

Whereas the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, though they fall far short of the ideal, do nevertheless, present a historic possibility for a greater good than any workable alternative known at present: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh, That we endorse the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a presently practicable step in the direction of the ultimate ideal of a just peace maintained by a genuine world community; and

That we commend their support to our members and friends and the general public, with such improvements, as may now or later be effected; and

That this resolution is adopted without prejudice to the convictions of any minority present or absent, without binding our consciences, and with respectful consideration for the views of any who may disagree with us.

INCREASED QUOTA OF FARM MACHINERY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have received several resolutions from various farm organizations in Nebraska having to do with their request for a larger quota of farm machinery. The present situation has developed because of the fact that the distribution of farm machinery has been based on historical data which should not govern in connection with the distribution of farm machinery at this time. I think the matter is an extremely important one. Accordingly, I wish to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred together with the names of the signers.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

RESOLUTION FOR LARGER QUOTA OF FARM MACHINERY

Since the recent demand by the armed forces for many young farm workers will seriously jeopardize the food-production program, and since the machinery on farms is each year becoming more worn and obsolete and present replacements are inadequate, we, the members of the undersigned Farm Bureau units, request that you bring pressure to bear upon the proper authorities, that they release more farm machinery in order that the farmers may carry out the production program asked by the War Food Administration. We believe that this is the only way that the production goal can be attained.

Franklin County Farm Bureau, Franklin Unit: E. H. Monie, Edward Brotherton, Violette Brotherton, Roy R. Dunlap, Guy T. Rogers, Mrs. Guy T. Rogers, Mrs. H. Brotherton, Harry Brotherton, Charles J. Mucklow, Earl Beil, Mrs. Earl Beil, Mrs. Fern Mucklow, W. K. Versaw, H. W. Wistrand, Hobart L. Robertson, Aifon Horing, Mrs. W. K. Versaw, Mrs. H. W. Wistrand, Mrs. Ethel Horing, Laura Robertson.

Riverton Unit of Franklin County Farm Bureau: Nelson Kugler, Herold Hundt, Ralph Detlefsen, Mildred Detlefsen, Edna Hundt, Myrl Kugler, Milo Kugler.

Macon Unit, Franklin County Farm Bureau: Alfred Kloser, Frank Cahill, M. J. Hafermann, H. J. Yelken, Carl K. Rademacher, John Bienhoff, John C. Frecks, Otto F. Johnson, Albert Fritso, John F. Jelken, William F. Fruhling, Tom L. Dom, Louis Meyer, George F. Schuman, Jr.

Hildreth Unit, Franklin County Farm Bureau (25 members): George Warnken, John T. Stuhmer, William Knight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 519. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Straka; with amendments (Rept. No. 48).

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 49); and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 50).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 46. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 51); and

S. 47. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 52).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 64, agreed to January 29, 1945, the Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 15, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat, and peanuts.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 532. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Swiss colony at New Glarus, Wis., and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 533. A bill to create United States civil service boards of appeals; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 534. A bill for the relief of Michael McGinn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 535. A bill to prevent pollution of the waters of the United States and to correct existing water pollution as a vital necessity to public health, economic welfare, healthful recreation, navigation, the support of invaluable aquatic life, and as a logical and desirable post-war public-works program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 536. A bill to direct the Attorney General to conduct an investigation to determine whether Charles Chaplin should be deported; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 537, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for certain exclusions from gross income for income-tax purposes in the case of persons who served in

the armed forces during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 539. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. TOBEY) introduced Senate bill 540, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 541. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 542. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz;

S. 543. A bill for the relief of Felix Fredericksen;

S. 544. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy;

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Anne Loacker; and

S. 546. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims with respect to the taking of lands in the southeast portion of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 547. A bill for the relief of Benjamin E. McCall; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 548. A bill to create a Commission to be known as the Alaskan International Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 549. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act by striking out present section 226 and substituting a new section 226; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 550. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Presley Holliday, quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, on the retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 552. A bill to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 553. A bill to provide for the investment in United States savings bonds of pay and allowances credited to prisoners of war and certain other persons absent from their posts of duty; and

S. 554. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all Government navy yards, naval stations, arsenals, and other Government establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 555, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

S. 556. A bill to establish a commission to study and report legislative recommendations on a coordinated transportation policy affecting aircraft, railroads, busses, and trucks, including their communications needs; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. WHERRY introduced Senate bill 557, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 558. A bill to provide for the adequate production of seed legumes required in the war food-production program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the National Commandant of the Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures from January 1, 1944, through December 31, 1944, and a report of the proceedings and activities of the club (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the annual convention of the County Officers' Association of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 693) to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Enrolled House Resolution 7

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to Continue the House Committee on Small Business

"Whereas there was created in the Seventy-sixth Congress a committee known as the Committee on Small Business; and

"Whereas this committee has functioned for the betterment of the small businessman as a fact-finding group, whose results to date have been instrumental in affording protection to small business throughout the Nation, and in formulating laws beneficial to the small businessman; and

"Whereas should the House committee be abolished and its activities be eliminated by the Seventy-ninth Congress small business would lose an active defender: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Oklahoma Legislature, That we memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to recommend that the Committee on Small Business be continued in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 15th day of January 1945."

"Enrolled House Resolution 17

"Resolution memorializing Congress to issue a memorial 50-cent piece in honor of Will Rogers, great Oklahoma humorist, philosopher and world citizen

"Whereas Oklahoma is the birthplace and final resting place of the beloved philosopher, humorist, and cowboy statesman, Will Rogers, who walked with kings and did not lose the common touch; and

"Whereas we desire to keep-alive his memory as the outstanding example of Oklahoma and world citizenship, and to perpetuate those virtues of humility and good will which he expressed in his life; and

"Whereas a proposal has been advanced in the National Congress that a memorial 50-cent piece be coined in honor of Will Rogers, and this project has been endorsed by Members of the National Congress, the Will Rogers Memorial Commission, and others interested in preserving the name of Will Rogers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That we memorialize Congress to speedily pass legislation authorizing the coinage of a 50-cent Will Rogers memorial piece, and that we urge the Oklahoma Members in the National Congress to use their best

efforts to push this legislation to a successful conclusion; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be printed in the journal and that the clerk of the house be directed to send by registered mail a copy of this resolution to the honorable Members of the Oklahoma delegation in Washington, D. C.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of February 1945."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Enrolled House Resolution 15

"Resolution petitioning and memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Stigler bill providing for an additional United States military academy at Muskogee, Okla.

"Whereas on January 1, 1945, Congressman WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of the Second District of Oklahoma, introduced a bill 'To establish an additional United States military academy at Muskogee, in the State of Oklahoma'; and

"Whereas said bill is now pending for consideration by the Congress; and

"Whereas said bill, if enacted into law, would benefit the Government of the United States, and the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas the hills and valleys of eastern Oklahoma constitute an excellent location for said military academy, presenting all the field problems for field trials necessary to solve by cadets in attendance in such academy; and

"Whereas there is no such academy located in this part of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of Oklahoma and surrounding territory have been loyal, patriotic Americans; this State being the present place of abode of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians; and

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma has cooperated loyally and faithfully with the Government of the United States in every enterprise to prepare and conduct and carry on any and all wars the United States has been engaged in: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That the Congress of the United States be and is petitioned and memorialized to enact into law the bill introduced by Congressman STIGLER; be it further

"Resolved, That the historical society, the highway department, the conservation department, the game and fish department, and any other department of government in this State familiar with the topography of that portion of the State in and around Muskogee, Okla., be requested to cooperate fully and furnish any and all information available or possible should the same be requested; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is instructed to forward by air mail a copy of this resolution to each member of the delegation in Congress from Oklahoma.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 6th day of February 1945."

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial requesting the Senate of the United States to ratify the treaty with Mexico relating to the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers

"To the Senate of the United States:

"Your memorialist represents:

"That it is the belief of this body that the pending treaty between the United States and Mexico, respecting the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers, signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, as clarified by the protocol signed November 14, 1944, will, as it pertains to the waters of the Colorado River, prove very beneficial to

the United States and to the State of Arizona.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That your honorable body ratify the proposed treaty at the earliest possible date.

"Adopted by the senate January 11, 1945.

"Adopted by the house January 12, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor January 15, 1945."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial requesting Congress to pass the McCarran-Sumners bill

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"In view of the numerous regulatory and administrative agencies, possessing quasi-judicial functions, which have in recent years been added to the administrative branch of the Federal Government, and because of the many rights of citizens affected by the regulations and decisions of these agencies, it is deemed of the highest importance that legislation be enacted prescribing fair and impartial procedure by which these agencies shall be governed in the discharge of their functions, and providing for adequate judicial review of their rulings.

"Such legislation is proposed in the McCarran-Sumners bill (S. 7, H. R. 1203), pending before the Congress.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That the Congress enact the McCarran-Sumners bill.

"Adopted by the senate January 19, 1945.

"Adopted by the house January 31, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor February 3, 1945."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

By Mr. WILSON (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Whereas the return to standard time will help increase food production and help win the war and mean more daylight working hours for agriculture; and

"Whereas daylight saving time has proven a burden; and

"Whereas daylight saving time has failed to save daylight or accomplish its purpose: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to immediately take the necessary steps to return the United States to standard time and abolish daylight saving time by terminating the War Act of January 20, 1942 (c. 7, 56 Stat. 9), said act providing that Congress had power by concurrent resolution to terminate said act.

"That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress."

DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS—RESOLUTIONS OF THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH OF PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. MYERS presented a resolution adopted by the First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1945, FOR THE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

FEBRUARY 15, 1945.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted
the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. J. Res. 85]

The Committee on Appropriations to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) entitled "Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture" reports the same favorably to the Senate without amendment.

The United States Code, title 13, section 216, provides for a quinquennial census of agriculture and livestock which will show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country which shall relate to the crop year.

Congress recognized the need and worth of this census by making available an appropriation of \$650,000 in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, for preliminary work in connection therewith. Later, in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, an appropriation of \$7,250,000 was provided for actually taking, compiling, and publishing the census.

It has developed that enumerators are unwilling to engage their services at the rates of pay used in arriving at the amount contained in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act of 1945, and it is now apparent that if the work is to be carried through successfully additional funds will be necessary.

Under date of January 18, 1945, the President submitted to Congress in House Document No. 33 a recommendation for an additional appropriation of \$6,784,000, which is the amount carried in this resolution.

2 ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE, 1945

It is the opinion of the Director of the Census that if sufficient funds are available, permitting the payment of higher wages per schedule than was contemplated under the original appropriation, competent enumerators in sufficient numbers can be found among people so situated as not to be available for regular employment. It is expected that the chief source of such employees will be members of farm families. However, first preference will be given to honorably discharged veterans, members of their families, and members of the families of men still in the service. All appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service and may not be employed if needed and available for war work.



Calendar No. 44

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 85

[Report No. 49]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 12, 1945

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

FEBRUARY 15, 1945

Reported by Mr. McKELLAR, without amendment

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945
for the Census of Agriculture.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the amount named in the appropriation contained in
4 the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, for
5 preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quin-
6 quennial Census of Agriculture of the United States is hereby
7 increased by \$6,784,000.

Passed the House of Representatives February 7, 1945.

Attest:

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk.

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 85

[Report No. 49]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the
fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agri-
culture.

FEBRUARY 12, 1945

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

FEBRUARY 15, 1945

Reported without amendment

6. MEXICAN WATER TREATY. Rep. Hinshaw, Calif., criticized the Mexican Water Treaty and inserted Calif. Attorney General's testimony before the Senate Committee on this subject (pp. 1308-10).
7. PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY. Passed without amendment H.J. Res. 15, authorizing the President to proclaim Oct. 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day (p. 1290).
8. FOREIGN SERVICE: PERSONNEL. On objection of Rep. Rich, Pa., passed over H.R. 689, to enable the State Department to more effectively carry out its responsibilities in the foreign field, ^{and} to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad under a Foreign Service unified under the guidance of the State Department (pp. 1288-9).
9. CLAIMS. Passed as reported H.P. 129, to provide for the barring of claims by the U.S. in connection with checks and warrants "against banks or other endorsers or guarantors of a Government check in case of forgery or when the money has been obtained by fraudulent means... unless the Government within 6 years from the time the check was presented to the Treasury Department starts proceedings to collect the money" (pp. 1290-1).

SENATE

10. MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY. Sen. Murray, Mont., submitted a resolution to rerefer S. 555, creating a Missouri Valley Authority, to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and stated that he intended to call the resolution up for consideration next Thurs., Feb. 22 (p. 1237).
11. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE. Passed, without amendment, H. J. Res. 85, appropriating \$6,784,000 additional for the census of agriculture for the fiscal year 1945 (pp. 1243-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
12. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted several Nebr. cooperative creamery resolutions urging increased butterfat prices (pp. 1235-6).
13. ALASKA. Received an Alaska legislature petition criticizing Interior's land and water policies in Alaska (p. 1234).
14. TAXATION. Received from the Ark. legislature a resolution opposing a constitutional amendment to place a 25% limit on income tax (p. 1235).
15. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Reed, Kans., inserted a petition by sundry citizens opposing transportation of liquor because of the manpower shortage (p. 1235).
16. FOREIGN RELIEF. Sen. McMahon, Conn., urged relief for Italy (p. 1235). Sen. Burton, Ohio, discussed the future policy of the U. S. in North Africa and the Middle East, particularly regarding UNRRA (pp. 1245-54).
17. PERSONNEL; SELECTIVE SERVICE. Sen. Maybank, S. C., inserted his letter from the Selective Service System discussing procedures relating to deferments of Federal employees (pp. 1255-6).
18. NOMINATION. Sen. Taft, Ohio, criticized the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce while Sens. Pepper, Fla., and Hill, Ala., spoke in favor of his nomination (pp. 1256-68, 1269-77).

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section

79th-1st, No. 31

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued February 20, 1945, for actions of Monday, February 19, 1945)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

A.A.A.; tobacco.....2	Foreign relief.....16	Personnel.....8, 17, 25
Adjournment.....19	Foreign service.....8	Post-war planning.....36
Alaska.....13	Labor, farm.....33, 38	Price supports.....12
Animal production.....23	Lands.....13	Property.....27
Appropriations.....1, 11	Latin America.....3	Pulaski's Memorial Day...7
Claims.....9	Lend-lease.....37	Reclamation.....10, 39
Committee authority.....5	Loan agencies.....31	Regulatory functions....24
Congressional organiza- tion.....4	Machinery, farm.....26	Sabotage.....20
Dairy industry.....12	Missouri Valley Authori- ty.....10	Selective service.17, 28, 33
Food adm. (general).....38	National service.....35	Taxation.....14, 22
Food production.....28	Nomination.....18, 34	Transportation.....15
Food supply.....30, 38	Patents.....21, 32	Veterans.....26, 29
		Water utilization...6, 13

HOUSE

1. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946. Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H.R. 2252 (H.Rept. 158)(pp. 1279, 1311).
2. A.A.A.; TOBACCO. Passed without amendments H.J.Res. 98, providing for the establishment of national marketing quotas and acreages for fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco at the 1943-44 level (pp. 1291, 1295-5).
3. LATIN AMERICA. Agreed, without amendment, to H.Res. 37, expressing the approval of the House of Representatives of action toward establishing an American Inter-parliamentary Congress (pp. 1292-5).
4. CONGRESSIONAL ORGANIZATION. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H.Con.Res. 18, establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. In final form the resolution provides for a joint committee to study the organization of Congress and for the committee to make recommendations for improvements in such organization with a view to strengthening its organization, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with the other branches, and better enabling it to meet its responsibilities; that the study shall include Senate-House relationships, employment and compensation of officers and employees, and the structure of the various committees of both Houses; for the functioning of the committee during the 79th Congress; and prohibits recommendations on the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, precedents, and consideration of any matter on the floor of either House. (pp. 1298-300.).
5. RULES COMMITTEE. Rep. Bulwinkle, Mass., criticized Rules Committee action, stating "it was going into the question of legislation" and Rep. Rankin, Miss., defended the Committee, stating that it "was acting within its proper scope" (p. 1281).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARRAN in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to consideration of House Joint Resolution 100. The appropriation is a necessary one for additional hospital facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I concurred in reporting the bill to the Senate because the Congress by reason of previous funds authorized, seems to be committed to the taking of an agricultural census. I wish to say that it is one of those things the wisdom of which could well be questioned. With a so-called manpower shortage in existence, it is questionable whether we should appropriate several million dollars for an agricultural census to be taken at this time, involving the employment of several thousand individuals whose work will be necessary to the taking of such a census. I personally disapprove the project and the appropriation, but because of previous appropriation commitments I believe perhaps the pending joint resolution should be allowed to pass, and I shall raise no further objection.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Tennessee explain the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so. Congress passed a law providing for the usual agricultural census to be taken this year. Such a census is taken every 5 years. It is necessary to expend \$6,784,000. A joint resolution providing for that amount has been passed by the House of Representatives and approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and I have been directed to report it, and it is now before the Senate. The joint resolution would furnish money with which to take the usual agricultural census.

Mr. LANGER. Does the census include the amount of livestock and the number of radios which farmers have?

Mr. McKELLAR. It includes everything that pertains to the farming industry.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give us a list of what the census includes? Does the Senator have such a list handy?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have a list before me, but the census includes everything that pertains to the farm.

Mr. LANGER. Does it include farm machinery, for example?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, it does.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have received an inquiry from New England as to whether the census is actually in process now. Does the Senator know whether it is?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes, it is; but those taking the census require the amount of money provided by the joint resolution in order to continue it. They do not have enough money to continue it.

Mr. BREWSTER. How much is available now?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would \$7,000,000 be approximately the amount they already have?

Mr. McKELLAR. \$7,250,000 was the original amount allowed. They require \$6,784,000 additional.

Mr. BREWSTER. So this is a 100-percent increase?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not quite that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Well, practically that. Can the Senator from Tennessee explain why so extraordinary an increase is necessary or desirable?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not desirable at all, of course, but those who are conducting the census cannot obtain workers to take the census unless they have the additional amount of money provided by the measure before the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean they have doubled the pay of the workers taking the census?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; they have not doubled their pay.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then, why is a 100-percent increase necessary?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House of Representatives allowed originally only \$7,250,000. Those taking the census did not obtain all they required. The amount provided by the joint resolution is to supplement the original amount.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not gather the impression of much enthusiasm on the part of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I may answer the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Maine by stating that the increase is due, as the Senator will discover on page 2 of the House committee report, to the rate of pay increase from 50 to 60 cents to 89.8 cents per schedule.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is the principal reason for the increased amount asked, I will say to the Senator from Maine. It was originally intended to pay for each schedule about 60 cents, but those in charge could not obtain men to do the work for that amount, so the pay was raised to 89 cents. Those are the facts, and we all know about the

shortage of labor that exists, and the difficulty of obtaining individuals to do such work. We have already committed ourselves to the taking of this census, and the only way it can be done is to increase the amount to be paid.

Mr. BREWSTER. What about the manpower shortage concerning which we now hear a very great deal? No later than last night the Secretary of War pointed out how great was the shortage of manpower.

Mr. McKELLAR. All employees or appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service, and may not be employed if needed and available for war work.

Mr. BREWSTER. Are they civil-service employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they are not civil-service employees. The appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service, and may not be employed at all if needed and available for other work. Boys, elderly persons, and a great many women, who can do the work, are being employed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Tennessee feel assured that this work will in no way impede the war effort?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it will not impede the war effort. We have committed ourselves to this census. We have enacted the law, and have appropriated a part of the money. If the work is to be completed, it will be absolutely necessary to appropriate this additional amount.

Mr. BREWSTER. That does not quite answer the question. We have suspended many of our peacetime activities because of the pressure of the war effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. This is certainly something we could get along without, if any of the individuals to be employed could contribute to the acceleration of our war effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true. It is for that reason that we provided that the employees should be cleared through the United States Employment Service and by the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BREWSTER. As I understand, that is not provided in the bill. It is simply an assurance which the Senator has from the officials in charge.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. Our experience has been such as to create a good deal of concern on my part because of the war situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure that the war effort will not be interfered with in the slightest.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator stated that this census is being taken under authority of existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so stated.

Mr. WHITE. In that statement he is wholly correct. Some time ago we enacted legislation providing for an agricultural census every five years. The fifth year has now been reached and is being provided for in the proposed legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I am in much the same frame of mind about the legislation as is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. We seem to have authorized this work by law; and yet, in my view it will be of comparatively little value to anyone. Conditions are so abnormal that I do not know of any lessons that can be drawn from a census of agriculture taken at this time. I have felt, too, that the increases in pay were quite unwarranted. The testimony before the House committee was to the effect that the enumerators to a very large extent would be women. As the Senator from Nebraska has stated, in past censuses the rate of pay has been from 50 to 60 cents a schedule. In the present instance the rate of pay is proposed to be increased to \$1.02 a schedule.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is mistaken. The average is 89 cents.

Mr. WHITE. I believe the Senator is correct. The average is 89 cents, but in many instances the testimony shows that the rate will be \$1.02 a schedule. It is estimated that an enumerator can complete eight schedules a day. So it is proposed to pay the enumerators \$8 a day for this work. I am glad to see anyone receive \$8 a day, but I question very much the propriety of such an increase.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I should read an excerpt from the report:

It is the opinion of the Director of the Census that if sufficient funds are available, permitting the payment of higher wages per schedule than was contemplated, under the original appropriation, competent enumerators in sufficient numbers can be found among people so situated as not to be available for regular employment. It is expected that the chief source of such employees will be members of farm families. However, first preference will be given to honorably discharged veterans, members of their families, and members of the families of men still in the service. All appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service and may not be employed if needed and available for war work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee tell us the number of employees necessary to take this census?

Mr. McKELLAR. Approximately 27,000 enumerators will be required. They will work from 4 to 6 weeks.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for that information. In the face of the manpower shortage, I feel that Senators should know that 27,000 enumerators will be required to make the census. In view of that fact, I was greatly alarmed when this measure came before the Appropriations Committee. In the last session of Congress I opposed the appropriation for this purpose. I talked to an official in the War Food Administration, one for whom I have high regard. He feels that the census is absolutely necessary at this time in order to obtain information as to the production of food.

As I understand, the Division of Statistics in the Department of Agriculture makes estimates. Such estimates are made in my State. However, the War Food Administration must rely upon authentic information gathered by the enumerators, so as to fit the actual in-

ventories to the estimates which are made. The work is being done on a 5-year basis. Because of the fact that it is absolutely necessary for the military effort in connection with the production of food, I voted to report the joint resolution to the Senate, and I will vote for its passage; but I think it should be regarded strictly as a war measure. The census should be taken only in the interest of the production of food. In peacetimes the creation of an agency with 27,000 employees would be absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask the junior Senator from Nebraska a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Nebraska whether or not the A. A. A. records already show the acreage of farm land and the acreage of principal crops, without the necessity for a census.

Mr. MURRAY. In answer to that question, let me say to the distinguished Senator that this statement is absolutely correct. However, I wish to go further and state that the War Food Administration official with whom I talked stated that A. A. A. records did not provide the reliable information needed. He stated that the census had to be taken so that the administration could fit the picture to what the census actually revealed. The man who told me that is a man in whom I have a great deal of confidence. However, it is my opinion that there is duplication in two or three departments, and that when the military need shall have ceased to exist—which I hope will be soon—it will be absolutely unnecessary to take such a census.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAR PROGRAM AND FUTURE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN NORTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the statement I am about to submit is a report on the war program and future policy of the United States in north Africa and the Middle East.

This statement supplements the preliminary report made to the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, now known as the Mead committee, by its subcommittee on north Africa and the Middle East. It is based upon the trip to that area taken by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and myself December 28, 1944, to January 18, 1945. This statement also supplements the comments on that trip already made to the Senate by the Senator from Delaware as chairman of the subcommittee.

As the preliminary report has been made available to the Senate and contains the conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee and as the comments of the Senator from Delaware

contain a description of the trip with comments on what the subcommittee observed, I shall direct this statement primarily to an analysis of the lessons which I believe can be drawn from the trip.

I shall do this under six headings: First, the trip illustrates the feasibility of legislative investigations by the United States Senate outside of continental United States; second, a need exists for improved coordination among agencies of the United States abroad; third, a need exists for a clear, vigorous policy as to investments of the United States abroad; fourth, suggestions as to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—U. N. R. R. A.; fifth, petroleum in the Middle East; sixth, north Africa and the Middle East are a proving ground for a constructive, vigorous foreign policy of the United States.

I. THE TRIP ILLUSTRATES THE FEASIBILITY OF LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATIONS BY THE UNITED STATES SENATE OUTSIDE OF CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

This trip has unique value as an example of how the United States Senate can appropriately exercise its investigatory powers outside of continental United States in proportion to the expanding interests of the United States. The report will demonstrate that each of the subjects investigated is well within the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the United States Senate and of the Mead committee investigating the national defense program. It will demonstrate that in order to investigate these subjects intelligently it was necessary to go to the places visited. It will further demonstrate that the investigation of these subjects on the ground by a subcommittee serves not only to advise the subcommittee and, through it, the United States Senate as to such subjects, but also emphasizes to administrative officers on the ground the closeness of their responsibility to their Government at home and to the individual taxpayers represented by that Government. The gathering of Government officials to attend subcommittee hearings abroad, as is done at home, brings those officials into contact with each other in a way that is of direct benefit to them and to their work.

Assuming, then, the value of the investigations made on this trip, it is my first purpose to derive from it certain lessons as to the feasibility of such trips abroad from the point of view of time, effort, and expense. The scope of this trip was limited to the jurisdiction of one committee of the Senate, its time was limited to approximately 3 weeks, and its purposes were limited to four specific subjects.

The subcommittee was instructed to report its findings and recommendations to its parent committee, rather than to the Senate or to the public. It was further instructed to omit, as far as possible, news conferences abroad and side trips not related to the specific subjects assigned to the subcommittee. I may say we completely avoided such diversions. The result was that the entire trip from Washington to Iran, on the Persian Gulf, and return took only 22 days. The first 6 of these days came

[PUBLIC LAW 5—79TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 5—1ST SESSION]

[H. J. Res. 85]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the amount named in the appropriation contained in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, for preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quinquennial Census of Agriculture of the United States is hereby increased by \$6,784,000.

Approved February 28, 1945.

